



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2009

No. 16

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 27, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON-LEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND M. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, today I come to the well and before my colleagues to remember one of my employees who was with me for 5 years and a true Chicago South Sider, an individual who worked diligently here in the Washington, D.C. community for many, many years, Ray Fitzgerald.

Ray was my legislative director for 5 years. Before that, he worked for the State of Illinois in Gov. Jim Edgar's administration. He then moved to the

Science Committee for 1 year, and then came to my office.

Ray, during his time here, met the love of his life, Kristin Wolgemuth, who also was a Congressional staffer and also from Chicago, and who had worked for Harris Fawell, a Congressman and Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT from the Chicagoland area. They fell in love, got married, and then were able to enjoy D.C. and the community and work hard for this country. They have three children; Nora, 7, Maggie, 4, and Lucy, 2. Ray was a devout Roman Catholic, and Ray was able to live his faith, along with his wife, Kristin, and affect many lives positively.

Ray just last week lost his life in a terrible battle with cancer. Many of us from around the country attended his funeral yesterday in Chicago and the wake the night before. The wake was as large as you would expect when you have a loved one who has left you. Of course, the funeral was just as large, and I appreciated the funeral service focusing on the hope of salvation to those who believe, and remembering Ray's life.

But the thing that highlighted Ray's service here in Washington and the respect he garnered was his honesty, his transparency, the friendships that he developed and his work effort. Many people from the Washington, D.C. area went out for the wake and for the funeral yesterday, and we will pass the word out to the Washington, D.C. community about a memorial service that will be conducted here in Washington in the weeks to come. Kristin and the girls are coming out, along with Ray's mother and other family members and friends.

What was as important in this fight with cancer was the ministry that Kristin and Ray did as they struggled with what is God's will. Many times we pray for God's will to be done, hoping that it is the answer to our desires and aspirations and prayers. God's will in

this case was not for Ray to stay here on Earth, but to take him up in His loving arms with Him in Heaven and thus be truly healed.

This battle that was waged joined numerous people from across the country as Kristin was faithful in providing us the highs and the lows of the battles; the times when they were able to take the girls out to parks and to zoos and the times the family was very hopeful, but also times when Ray was really physically just struggling. She continued to ask for prayer and support and focus on her husband, her family and that loving environment.

One of the last e-mails I sent to them was talking about how they were able to comply with God's will. I really hated when Ray left Washington, D.C. He was a trusted confidant and a good friend. But, in hindsight, I see how God was preparing for his departure to get him in and around his family. He has five sisters. His mother is still there. Kristin has an extended family in that area. They were there to lift Ray, Kristin and the girls up and provide the love and care that they needed in this battle, and they will be there for the duration of strengthening the family and helping Kristin raise these three young girls.

I would like to share one of the last e-mails that Kristin sent to us as a whole on the announcement of her husband's death.

She writes, "Loved ones, oh to never have to write this e-mail. After meeting with all of Ray's doctors yesterday and today it is clear that they have done all they can do to fight his cancer."

"Despite the many rounds of chemo, the cancer is growing and getting stronger and Ray is much too weak to endure another round of chemo. Even if he weren't so sick, Ray's liver status renders chemo dangerous and ineffective."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H529

In this, she is talking about putting him into hospice, and Ray died shortly after that.

Now, think of a young wife and mother of three children, ages 7, 4 and 2, to be so strong in faith. She always would end her e-mails with the phrase "not afraid and not alone," and this is in the 10 month battle with cancer. "Not afraid and not alone." In the funeral yesterday, I thought I heard Kristin say many people attributed that to her. She attributed it to her husband.

TRIBUTE TO KATIE STAM, MISS AMERICA 2009, AND RYAN GUTHRIE, CHIEF OF STAFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO KATIE STAM, MISS AMERICA 2009

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise for two reasons this morning, on this snowy day in Washington, DC.

Number one is to congratulate Katie Stam, who is the new Miss America, who won her crown last Saturday in Las Vegas. Katie is from my hometown of Seymour, Indiana, and we could not be more proud of Katie and her accomplishments, more than ever before. This is a real tribute to her. She is a talented young lady. I know her personally. I had the opportunity to speak with her on Sunday to congratulate her on her accomplishments. She is a great singer and a beautiful woman.

She is also a friend of the family. She and my youngest daughter, Libby, know each other very well, and we all speak very highly of Katie. I know for certain that she is going to represent not only Seymour, not only Indiana, but the entire United States of America as America's not only beautiful person outside, but beautiful person inside as well.

We are immensely proud of Katie. I know her family very well. They are great people. It is just a proud moment for all of us to stand here in the well of the House today to congratulate Katie on all of her accomplishments that she has done.

TRIBUTE TO RYAN GUTHRIE, CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, the second reason that I rise here this morning is to honor my Chief of Staff, Ryan Guthrie, who is moving on to bigger and better things.

Ryan Guthrie has been with me since day one, when I began the campaign for Congress back in 1998. He is a graduate of Indiana University. He is also from Seymour, Indiana, my hometown. He has been with me from the get-go.

Madam Speaker, in this business of politics you get to a point where you have to depend reliably on people that you trust, and I can't think of anybody that I trust more than Ryan Guthrie. He has been a stalwart companion of mine. He has been there with me from day one. He has been through the battles. He has been through the victories and through the defeats. We have

laughed and cried together, and I am going to miss him very much, but I wish him well.

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROCESS A BREATH OF FRESH AIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, we are hearing a lot here on Capitol Hill about Otto von Bismarck's old sausage metaphor, that one doesn't want to watch either sausage or legislation being made. Well, for too long, Madam Speaker, the legislative process in this House was a scene right out of Upton Sinclair's graphic novel, "The Jungle."

But currently with a new Congress and new Administration I would say that it has been a breath of fresh air watching this legislative process. It has been open. The ingredients have been great. The legislative leadership, the new President and his administrative team, have been involved, talking with people in both parties, in both chambers, and we are moving towards a package that I think people ought to embrace enthusiastically.

The economic stimulus is moving into stage II, almost the home stretch. We are putting down positions, principles and guidelines. Any timetable at this juncture is perhaps artificial in nature. The target figure of \$825 billion or \$800 billion or \$850 billion is a little arbitrary and subject to amendment, to adjustment. Such parameters are useful, maybe necessary. They are not set in stone, and it is necessary that we do this right. What we can agree upon is to make the economic impact as soon as possible while we help rebuild and renew America to make it better.

I am concerned as the process moves forward, particularly as it relates to the infrastructure portion, that we make sure that the money gets to where it needs to go.

□ 1045

Primarily, I want to make sure that our metropolitan areas around the country are not shortchanged.

The last Surface Transportation Act was held up for 2 years because people were arguing about whether States got an allocation that was fair enough. But the greatest disparity for transportation funding in this country was between metropolitan areas, which seldom got their fair share: 78 cents on the dollar in Dallas, southern California shortchanged by over \$1 billion.

One of the things we ought to do now, in this package while it's still in the formative stage, is to make sure that we use the existing STP allocation for all funds, not just part of the transportation funding. This formula would guarantee that metropolitan areas get their fair share and not concentrate money unduly in State departments of transportation.

The second suggestion I would make is that we not use a lot of onerous paperwork to make sure that people are complying with the use-it-or-lose-it provisions.

We have very powerful compliance tools. We could simply make modest reductions in future revenue streams for people that don't make their target—hold them accountable, get the spending, and be able to protect the Treasury.

Third, we ought to consider having local incentives for people that are actually going to reach in and put more of their own money into projects, being able to provide some modest incentive so that we reward and not penalize those who will get more money into the economy faster.

Last, we ought to assure that States put the money where it can be spent. For example, if the State of New York has areas that can't take advantage of their allocation in time, but there are areas that can, we encourage the shift. The City of New York has almost \$2 billion worth of projects that could meet that 2010 guideline. We ought to put language into this bill that encourages States to reallocate to areas that can use it, not risk losing it.

We ought to make sure that we don't shortchange transit investments. I think we ought to go back to the marker laid down by Chairman OBERSTAR last December, of \$12 billion; that ought to be a recommendation as a floor for transit. This would assure that we are able to make investments in these transportation activities that actually create more jobs than other types of transportation investments. Transit is very job intensive.

A perfect example is a project we have in Portland, Oregon, where we have had stuck in the Department of Transportation a "small-start" streetcar expansion project for months. It meets all the statutory criteria, but the Bush Department of Transportation and their FTA and OMB could not figure out how to allocate the money. They couldn't even issue "small start" administrative rules that complied with the statute.

This is an opportunity to be able to jump start something that would not only be millions of local dollars for the transit project, but it would incent millions more for related development along the alignment. And it's not just Portland, Oregon; it's Tucson, it's Seattle. We have a chance to jump start a new American industry for streetcars for the 80 communities around America who want to move in this direction, even manufacturing streetcars in America for the first time in two-thirds of a century.

I urge we move in a positive way. Support transit, support our metropolitan areas, get our economy moving while we revitalize our communities.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Almighty God and Lord of life, we seek Your guidance that we may live Your life in fullest measure.

Since the time of Sarah and Abraham, Your covenant with Your people has been the model of married life and social order. Renew us in faith and faithfulness.

May husbands and wives live in deep understanding, honoring each other both in their words and their goodness. May the bonds of intimacy grow in American family life, that hearts will be converted to lasting values and explore the joy discovered in the love and faithfulness they uncover in themselves and in each other.

Enable government of this Nation to create an atmosphere where family life may flourish for generations to come. Lord, from You comes guidance now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIREs led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 328. An act to postpone the DTV transition date.

THE ECONOMY IS UNRAVELING

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, 55,000 Americans lost their jobs yesterday. Nine thousand five hundred jobs were lost at the drug company Pfizer. They didn't have \$4 billion to keep 9,500 employees, but they had \$68 billion to buy another drug company, Wyeth, with the help of four banks, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup and Bank of America, which have collectively received \$238 billion in bailout monies and loan guarantees.

Using bailout funds for mergers and acquisitions which result in the loss of jobs is nothing new. The Treasury Department gave PNC \$5.2 billion in bailout funds, which PNC promptly used to take over National City Bank in Cleveland, my hometown, putting at least 7,800 jobs at risk.

Today, as Congress takes up an economic stimulus package, we are in a race to try to create jobs to stimulate the economy while corporations are getting bailout funds and cutting jobs. The economy is unraveling. We clearly cannot rely on the private sector to create jobs. When the private sector cuts jobs, and we are approaching unemployment levels of 10 percent in some States, then it's the duty of government to create jobs.

The stimulus package is a first step, but only a first step.

WE MUST INVEST IN PROJECTS TO BENEFIT OUR ECONOMY

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, if we want the recovery package to be successful, we must invest in projects to benefit our economy in the short term and in the long term. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act does just that.

Investing in our infrastructure creates 40,000 new jobs in New Jersey and has long-term benefits that will modernize our crumbling infrastructure. The recovery plan also provides additional long-term investment in energy, health care and education. Specifically, this bill provides New Jersey with \$3.4 billion over 2 years to modernize our schools, enhance our educational technology and increase aid to students.

Finally, this legislation provides immediate and direct tax relief for 95 percent of working families, and for job-creating small businesses. By helping the average American employer and employee with their taxes, we ensure they have income to grow their businesses and make investment in the future.

I urge support for the bill.

TET, THE LUNAR NEW YEAR

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the second day of Tet, or more commonly known as the Lunar New Year. This year is the Year of the Water Buffalo.

Tet is a reaffirmation of the Vietnamese cultural heritage and tradition and is the largest and the most celebrated holiday for the Vietnamese people. It is when friends and families come together to celebrate the past year and, of course, we look to the future year.

On January 30, the Union of the Vietnamese Student Associations of Southern California will hold its annual Tet Festival in the City of Garden Grove. I would like to recognize the UVSA and the Vietnamese community for their endless efforts in bringing students, young professionals and community organizations together for the annual Tet Festival.

The Vietnamese American community plays a vital economic and cultural role in the 47th District of California, and I am very proud of its efforts in fighting to achieve freedom and human rights for all Vietnamese people.

As the Representative of the 47th District, it is a great honor to represent one of the largest Vietnamese communities in the world, and I would like to congratulate the Vietnamese community for all their successes this past year and to wish them a very happy new year, Chuc Mung Nam Moi.

TURN AROUND THE MALDISTRIBUTION OF THIS NATION'S WEALTH AND INCOME

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the stimulus bill today, it's important to reflect on how we got into this financial morass.

After all, over the last 8 years of the Bush administration, we saw the highest corporate profit and the deepest tax cuts in American history. So what's the problem? Well, 96 percent of the income growth over those 8 years went to the top 10 percent, only the wealthiest Americans.

They were the ones that benefited from the tax cuts. They benefited from the corporate deregulation. Forty-six percent of the profit went to financial services firms. So the problem is that only 4 percent of the income growth during the Bush years went to the 90 percent of middle-class Americans and those struggling to get into the middle class.

But what did they do to cope with this static income? Well, they did what the President told them to do. After 9/11 he said go shop in the mall, and that's what they did by borrowing. The increase in consumer spending was exactly equal to the amount of money borrowed from inflated home equity values.

That's what they did, and now we have the bust in real estate values and almost 40 percent of Americans are technically insolvent. That's why this bill starts to turn around that maldistribution of this Nation's wealth and income. That's why it should be supported today.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT IN BIPARTISAN FASHION TO ADDRESS OUR NATION'S ECONOMIC RECESSION

(Ms. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple weeks House committees, including Transportation and Infrastructure, on which I serve, have worked hard to craft an economic recovery package that would address the deep recession problems that we have. Likewise, over the last couple of months, we've worked with President Obama, and we have listened to economists, over 10 of them, all who say action needs to happen now.

Today, President Obama will meet with my colleagues, congressional Republicans, in a bipartisan fashion to really explain why this package is the best way to move forward and to turn this economy around. Conservative economic policies have not worked. In fact, we haven't produced jobs, and there has not been a production of economic prosperity.

The American people demanded change in November. The Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Package strives to do just that, helping to bring American jobs and providing 90 percent of middle Americans an immediate tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, if congressional Republicans really listen to President Obama today, they will support the legislation, and they will join us for change.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PACKAGE INVESTS IN THOSE HARDEST HIT BY ECONOMY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as the economic recession worsens, millions of Americans are in financial trouble and looking for some immediate assistance, but help is on the way. Tomorrow this House will vote on the Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act that will provide 3 to 4 million jobs here in America.

Those hit hardest by the economic crisis are the ones we need to help first, and we are doing that by extending unemployment benefits to people in America, millions who are still looking for jobs. It is difficult to find a job when thousands are being cut. Yesterday a record number of jobs were cut.

Economists say one of the best ways to stimulate the economy is to put the

money in the hands of people who will spend it immediately, spend it on necessities, and that's people who are out of work. That's something we are going to do.

It's also critical to give those people health insurance, and we will provide the States with money so that they can continue to provide Medicaid to those people who need that assistance. There are nearly 7 million unemployed Americans who need health insurance through COBRA. That will also be extended.

Mr. Speaker, this economic recession has hurt millions. This Congress will respond and provide assistance.

PUERTO RICO AND TERRITORIES DESERVE TO BENEFIT FULLY FROM ONGOING EFFORTS TO REVITALIZE ECONOMY

(Mr. PIERLUISI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1. As the Congressional Budget Office has just confirmed, the bill will have a very positive impact on our Nation's economy.

I am particularly grateful for the inclusion of Puerto Rico and the other U.S. territories in most of the bill's provisions. The territories are an integral part of the United States and thus deserve to benefit fully from our ongoing efforts to revitalize the economy.

As the final version of this bill is worked out, I will continue to seek more equitable treatment for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico in those few areas where I believe improvements should still be made.

For example, I will continue to make the case that Puerto Rico should receive an increase in Medicaid funding that better reflects the island's legitimate needs and does more to address the negative impact that the current spending cap is having on the Commonwealth's finances.

SUPPORT THE STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with America's economy in deep trouble. Families from Hobbs to Silver City and across the country are struggling. They are wondering if they will be able to make ends meet.

We must act now to help those families. I know that we won't all agree with every little part of the economic recovery bill that we are considering. I have some concerns myself, but I intend to support the package, not because it's perfect, but because it will create jobs and get our economy going. After all, that's what the people sent us here to do. If this bill passes, 684,000 New Mexicans will get a tax break and over \$400 million will go into infra-

structure and investments to create jobs and support economic development.

I am also pleased that the bill includes language from two bills that I introduced as a stimulus package for southern New Mexico to create green jobs and give families with kids a tax break. I urge my colleagues to pass this stimulus legislation so we can put America back on track and back to work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 181, LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT OF 2009

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 87 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 181) to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to commit.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 87.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 87 provides for consideration of S. 181, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009. This measure is identical to the version of the bill that was passed by this House on January 9 of this year by a significant vote of 247-171. The bill is also virtually identical to the version adopted in the 110th Congress.

It is well past time to get this legislation to the President for his signature. Today, we plan to do just that. After this bill is passed by the House later today, it will go directly to the White House and on President Obama's desk.

First, I want to commend Chairman MILLER for his leadership and his tireless efforts that have brought us so far. As my colleague, Chairwoman DELAURO, said during her eloquent remarks when this body first took up the bill 2 weeks ago, "We are here today because Lilly Ledbetter got short-changed—short-changed by her employer, the perpetrator of consistent pay discrimination lasting years, and short-changed again by the Supreme Court." And so now we are here today to fight for the final passage of this essential legislation.

As a mother of two daughters, a woman who has owned her own business myself much of my adult life, and as a newly elected Member of this body, I was proud to cast one of my first votes in favor of the Lilly Ledbetter Act, and I am proud that both Chambers have already made a strong commitment to protect workers against pay discrimination in the workplace.

This important legislation is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the underlying bill, S. 181, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I'd like to thank my friend the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) for the time.

I wish to welcome my distinguished colleague to the Rules Committee. She is a very important addition to the Rules Committee, and all of us have had the privilege of welcoming her in the last days. She stated in her statement that she is a new Member. She's also a new member of our committee, and obviously we are very pleased that she is.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule that, once again, clearly contradicts the majority's pledge to the American people to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Today, the majority proceeds to consider this legislation here on the floor of the House under a closed rule. That means, Mr. Speaker, that if this rule is passed and this legislation is brought to the floor under it, every Member of this House will be forbidden from offering any amendments to it. And what makes this act even more unfortunate is that this bill did not make its way through the committee process during this Congress, thereby abandoning the critical committee vetting and amendment process. In effect, what the majority is doing is sidelining the legislative process.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may say that

they would refute that claim because this legislation was considered in the previous Congress and should be passed quickly. But I bring to my colleagues' attention that we have dozens of new Members who were not here in the last Congress and are now not given the opportunity to participate in the usual and proper legislative process. So, something that truly concerns me is that this closed rule may, in effect, foreshadow how the majority will continue to run this House.

Considering the fact that we are only in the fourth week of the 111th Congress, and that when we take into account this rule, we count this rule, the majority has already considered four pieces of legislation under closed rules, I am quite concerned that the future will bring closed rule after closed rule to this floor.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is obvious. Will the majority continue its current path of blocking a bipartisan legislative process? Will they break their record of offering 64 bills, as they did under closed rules in the 110th Congress? Or will they change their behavior and open up this legislative process?

The majority promised that it would when it achieved the majority 2 years ago, but it has not done so. In fact, as I stated, in the last Congress, 64 bills—breaking all records of all prior Congresses—64 bills were brought to this floor under closed rules that do not permit any Members in this House to have their ideas considered in the form of amendments. So the facts do not lead to optimism.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for his kind welcome to a new Member.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new Member, and my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I'd like to thank the gentlewoman from Maine for the time. First, on the rule, before I get into the merits of the issue, which is a very important issue we all care about, with regard to the rule on this item, we did discuss it and debate it as part of the initial rules for the House of Representatives which we put in place. So this was discussed both within caucus and debated before the House as a whole.

I heard many objections from my colleagues on the other side, perhaps including the gentleman from Florida, with regard to the rules package, around the recommit issue, around the terms limit issue. I did not hear at that point extensive disagreement about the rules for this particular item, which were included in that initial package.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for his leadership on this issue of equality and fairness in the workplace and Representative DELAURO for her continued work on this issue. This bill restores and clarifies important protections that are a long time coming. This

bill corrects a wrong that has cost our working women more than just the dollars they have earned. Today's bill ensures that every worker, whether male or female, is given equal opportunity to fight against discrimination in the workplace.

When someone's pay is based not only their ability, not on their creativity, not on their personal drive, not on the value they create in the economy, but rather on their chromosomes, we cheat ourselves and we cheat our entire economy and all American families. Pay discrimination, whether based on gender or any nonperformance factor, means the best and the brightest within our society are being held back.

Discrimination is a cancer of economic inefficiency that eats away at American prosperity. When we fail to promote those who show leadership, we stifle the innovation and progress that make our country great. And while our country has made great strides, tremendous strides towards equality, we have a long way to go, and particularly women still continue to suffer for less pay for the same work than men across our Nation.

Pay discrimination furthers inequalities. And that is why I strongly support the Lilly Ledbetter Act. It gives women the legal hammer they need to continue to break the glass ceiling.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind my distinguished friend that we did make known our protest with regard to the fact that this legislation was in the list of bills that the majority on the first day of this Congress made clear would be brought to the floor without the possibility of amendments.

But it's interesting. When the Senate considered this legislation, the Senate did authorize and have debate on amendments. And so the question really, I think, is begged. What is the harm in allowing Members of this House to bring forth their ideas and letting this House work its way via the majority, the majority decide, and that way vet the ideas, discuss, debate, and decide which ideas brought forth by colleagues are appropriate and should be adopted. There's no harm in that, Mr. Speaker. There's no harm.

But, unfortunately, the pattern is continuing. The record was broken in the last Congress with regard to the number of closed rules, with regard to the number of pieces of legislation that were brought to this floor under a structure that did not allow any amendments to be proposed and debated by Members of either party. And that trend continues.

So we saw it not only on the first day of this Congress, but we see it today. Already, four bills, in the few days that this Congress has met, the 111th Congress has met already, we have seen four bills brought forth under these structures known as closed rules that do not allow Members of either party

from proposing ideas to improve any of the pieces of legislation that have been brought to the floor. I think that's the most unfortunate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I welcome her to the Rules Committee. This is going to be an exciting year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. This is a great day, this is an important day, because at long last we have a Congress and a President of the United States who not only believes in equal pay for equal work, but are willing to stand up and fight for equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Speaker, last year, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. We sent it to the United States Senate, and the Republicans in the United States Senate led a filibuster to block progress on this bill. And if we could overcome that filibuster, we have got a President of the United States named George Bush who said he would veto the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

□ 1230

Well, times have changed. We passed the bill again here in the House by a large margin, the Senate has passed it, and we are now accepting the Senate version.

My colleague from Florida says, well, what harm is it to open all this up again? The harm is, if you add or change this bill that we are voting on today, it will go back to the United States Senate; it will delay this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is wrong in any form, discrimination in the workplace. Paying a woman less than a man for equal work is wrong. It is something that is intolerable. And the important thing about this bill is it will move us closer to equality in the workforce. We still have a long way to go.

Mr. Speaker, on average, women earn just 78 cents for every dollar earned by a man. The Institute of Women's Policy Research has found that this wage disparity costs women anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages over a lifetime. And equal pay, Mr. Speaker, is not simply a women's issue; it is a family issue.

People should be paid for the quality of their work. They should not be discriminated against because of their gender. This vote is about ending discrimination. It is not about process, it is not about anything else. It is about whether at long last the United States Congress and the President of the United States are going to stand up for equal pay for equal work, and I think that this is an important step in the right direction.

I want to congratulate GEORGE MILLER, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, as well as ROB

ANDREWS, my colleague, for his incredible work on this. But we have waited long enough. George Bush and the Republicans have thrown enough roadblocks in our way. We have removed them. We are moving forward. We are moving toward equality. We are moving to end discrimination. And I am proud to stand on the floor and support the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that every piece of legislation brought to this floor is preceded by a debate on the terms of debate. In other words, the rule that we are now considering as a resolution sets the framework for how the underlying piece of legislation can be debated; and, if you will, it does set the process, the parameters for the process of the debate. It establishes the resolution, the rule that is debated and voted on before the underlying legislation can be considered, sets forth, determines if amendments are authorized; and, if so, what amendments are authorized. And so it is process that is debated by the rule, resolution commonly known as the rule, that is brought to the floor before legislation is considered. And that is what we are on right now. That is what we are discussing right now, the resolution, the rule to set the terms of debate.

What I am pointing out and will reiterate now is that it is most unfortunate and unnecessary, totally unnecessary, for the majority to bring forth legislation that will have the support of the majority on the floor when it is considered, the underlying legislation, to bring it forth with a rule that prohibits debate, that shuts out debate, that does not allow any amendments from any Member, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, on the underlying piece of legislation. That is what I am trying to point out, and I thought it was pretty clear.

Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentlelady from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and welcome her. Thank you for your leadership as well. It is my pleasure to be able to thank Chairman MILLER and also my friend from New Jersey, Congressman ANDREWS, for his work. And let me thank Congresswoman ROSA DELAURIO for her collective effort, and the Senate for moving forward.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, 70,000 Americans lost their jobs. I would suspect, as we work on the Economic Stimulus Package and TARP, that, unfortunately, we are going to see a constant march of those losing their jobs.

So why is it absolutely urgent and imperative that we move forward on the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act? Because this is a deterrent. When people are losing their jobs, 70,000 to 100,000 jobs a day, then there are normally one bread winner per family, man or

woman. How shameful it would be if that bread winner happens to be a woman and she is subjected to the unfair, disparate treatment of not being able to be paid equally in the workplace for her work.

It is well known that women are still earning 78 percent for every dollar earned by a man, and the Institute of Women's Policy Research has found that this wage disparity costs women anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages of a lifetime. Families of America cannot tolerate that now. The children of America cannot tolerate that now. When a woman rises to the occasion or she is already in the workplace, we must pay her fair wages, and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act allows any discrimination to be petitioned in the court, unlike Lilly Ledbetter, who was stymied by statutory process because she did not know.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the underlying rule and this bill, for as we move towards stimulating the economy and bringing jobs back to America, there is no way that this body, this Constitutional body, this country that believes in equality and justice for all can allow the constant discrimination in pay against women, for our children will suffer and our children's children will suffer. This bill is a necessity, because it is time now to eradicate the vestiges of discrimination on the basis of gender.

I ask my colleagues to support this rule, support this legislation, and to thank those who have been part of sponsoring this, and recognizing that in the 18th of congressional district where women go out to work every day, where they are providing the economic engine not only for our communities but for their families, must be treated fairly. 70,000 jobs lost yesterday. How many today? We must eradicate the unfair treatment of women in the workplace as relates to wages.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Education and Labor Committee that did such great work on this bill, Mr. ANDREWS.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate her for stewarding through in her first effort as a member of the Rules Committee this very historic piece of legislation. I think it is fitting that the gentlelady from Maine, who has excelled as a businessperson, as a State legislator, and now as a legislator here, has left her very considerable imprint on this process and I congratulate her.

The process has afforded under the rules of the House, both in committee and here on this floor, the opportunity for competing views to be heard about

this idea. I know, Mr. Speaker, we will hear frequently this afternoon that no one in the House supports discrimination on the basis of gender, and I believe that is true. The issue is not what we say, though, it is what we do. And we have a chance to take a step against discrimination on the basis of gender, but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there will be those who say this is the wrong time and the wrong step. I respectfully disagree.

There are those who say this is the wrong time to take this step because there will not be any statute of limitations; that is to say, people can sue forever if they have been the victim of employment discrimination. That is not accurate. You have 180 days in most States and a few more days in other States to file a claim once an act of discrimination has occurred. If a plaintiff does not file his or her claim by that time, the claim expires. This has been the law in a majority of circuits for a very long time. The U.S. Supreme Court disrupted that law. We are restoring it.

We expect to hear that there will be a flood of litigation, that the courthouses will be filled with people filing discrimination claims once this bill becomes law. That is not the case. Again, this bill restores the law as was understood by a majority of the circuits until the Supreme Court gave its ill-founded decision in the Ledbetter case. There was no flood of litigation under the prior understanding of the statute, and I do not believe there will be a flood of litigation now.

We will hear that this should apply only to intentional discrimination against women or others on the basis of gender. You know, if you are hit by a truck, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter if the truck driver intended to hit you or simply did so carelessly; if you are injured, you are injured. And if a person can show discrimination on the basis of any of the suspect categories under title VII under the law, they should be compensated, whether or not they can prove the discrimination was intentional. If there is a pattern and practice of discrimination because an employee is a woman, it should be remedied, and limiting this to intentional discrimination makes no sense.

We expect to hear that employees will sit on their rights; that they will have an opportunity to sue and wait for a very long time to do so. There is simply no evidence that people did that under the prior law as understood by the circuits. And, frankly, it would be a very ill-founded plaintiff who would do such a thing since it would cost them money to do so, reminding you that the burden of proof would fall upon the plaintiff to come up with the evidence of discrimination that took place a long time ago. So she or he has no incentive to sit on their rights and have to bear that burden of proof.

Finally, we will hear that employees will sit on their rights because somehow it makes economic sense to do so.

Mr. Speaker, it simply doesn't. The statute limits someone to go back 2 years backwards, for back pay, from the point at which discrimination took place. It would be a very irrational plaintiff who would wait a very long time to wait and go back those 2 years. The longer you wait, the more it costs you as a plaintiff.

So these arguments have been fully aired. I respectfully would argue they are all wrong. The time is right for us to stand up and not simply say we are against discrimination, but vote against discrimination, and pass this bill this afternoon.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that there is no need to close off debate; that this legislation could very easily have been debated openly; that Members on both sides of the aisle could have been given the opportunity to bring forth amendments as they were able to in the Senate, and that this legislation would move forward. It is not only unfortunate but unnecessary for the majority to close off debate. And, as I stated previously, there is a pattern.

In the last Congress, despite having promised the most open and the most transparent, the most fair Congress in history, the reality was exactly the opposite: More pieces of legislation were brought to this floor under closed rules that did not allow any amendments during the last Congress, the first Congress where our friends on the other side of the aisle had the majority in many years. More pieces of legislation were brought to the floor with closed rules prohibiting all amendments than in history, in all of history before in the history of Republic. So that is unfortunate.

But we are seeing the pattern continue. It has continued in these weeks in the beginning of the 111th Congress, and already this is the fourth bill, the fourth piece of legislation brought to the floor under a structure that does not permit any amendments under closed rules. That is what we are saying, it is uncalled for, it is unfortunate. And we hope, I guess because hope springs eternal, that our friends on the other side of the aisle will open the process up and will allow Members from both sides of the aisle to introduce amendments and have them debated and have the majority work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to lead this bill today as a newly elected Member and a new member of the Rules Committee, and I appreciate working alongside my new colleague on the Rules Committee. And I'm sure we will have a busy afternoon together.

We have heard several arguments and supportive thoughts from many of my distinguished colleagues from this side

of the aisle. And I appreciate their thoughts and their very hard work that it has taken to bring this bill to the floor and the momentous occasion we will have today when we are able to take this vote. I have also heard several arguments from my esteemed colleague from Florida. And I just want to remind him that when this bill was debated during the last session of Congress in the Education and Labor Committee where there were ample opportunities to bring amendments, those people in opposition only brought two amendments. So this is not a bill where there is tremendous disagreement. And in fact, the fact that there were no speakers virtually in opposition to this bill shows us what an important piece of legislation we are dealing with today, and in fact only were the discussion around the process taken up today. And I feel that since we have already debated this bill in the House and the Senate when it was last here, we passed it by an overwhelming margin of 247-171. It was passed by a bipartisan vote in the Senate of 61-36.

I am confident that this bill will receive very strong support today and want to say that I'm proud to be a Member of this body when this is happening. I do want to remind my colleagues that this legislation simply restores prior law. It is so important. And by passing it, we are making great strides in protecting workers by reversing the Supreme Court's Ledbetter decision as we have been eloquently described to today. We owe it to all American workers to strengthen, not weaken, nondiscrimination charges based on gender, race and religion.

It has passed the House, and it has passed the Senate previously. Today we are here to send it on to President Obama for what will be his first signature of any bill.

I urge my colleagues to support workers everywhere and vote "yes" on the underlying bill. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 88

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed three and one half hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, who may yield control of blocks of that time. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 88 provides for general debate on H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I would like to think this rule is not controversial because it is only about general debate, but it will lead the way to an important debate on the underlying legislation, H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Madam Speaker, George W. Bush left this country with an economy much worse off than the one he inherited from the Clinton administration. Eight years after being handed record budget surpluses, President Bush passed on to President Obama an economy that has record budget deficits and is in worse shape since the Great Depression.

Unemployment is rising. Fifty-five thousand more jobs were lost yesterday alone. Wages are stagnating. And work hours are being cut back. People are having trouble making ends meet, including putting food on the table.

And that is where this recovery package steps in. The provisions that make up the American Recovery and Reinvestment Package range from investments in infrastructure and green technology to extending unemployment for workers who have exhausted their benefits. We provide aid to struggling

State governments and tax cuts for low and middle-income families and small businesses. These are all good investments that we hope will help reinvigorate our economy. And I look forward to voting for them tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, some of the most important parts of this package, in my opinion, are the antihunger provisions that will not only stimulate the economy, but will also help combat hunger in this country. This recovery package includes \$20 billion for the Food Stamp program, \$200 million for elderly nutrition services, including Meals on Wheels and Congregate Meals, \$726 million to increase the number of States that provide free healthy dinners to children in need, \$150 million to purchase commodities for food banks to refill emptying shelves, and \$100 million to improve State management information systems for the WIC program.

Madam Speaker, food stamp increases will reach about 14 million low-income households as soon as 25 days after enactment. About 90 percent of all food stamp households have income below the poverty line. In other words, these are benefits that are timely and they are targeted.

It is important to note that every dollar in food stamps that a low-income family receives enables that family to spend an additional dollar on food or other items. And don't just take my word for it. Leading conservative economists support inclusion of these benefits in the recovery package. Former Reagan economic adviser Martin Feldstein has said that a temporary food stamp increase would place resources in the pockets of people with a high propensity to spend quickly, rather than save, the limited income that they have.

Mark Zandi, a former economic adviser to the McCain campaign, says that a temporary increase in food stamp benefits gives the best "bang for buck." Specifically, he estimates that such an increase would generate \$1.73 in increased economic activity for each \$1 in cost.

Madam Speaker, increasing food stamps is not charity. It is stimulus. It is not a handout or a give-away. But investments in antihunger programs do fulfill our moral commitment to make sure our fellow citizens have enough to eat. More than 36 million Americans went hungry in 2007, before the economy took this drastic spike downward. Yet the last stimulus plan signed into law didn't include increases for food stamps or any kind of antihunger programs.

The fact that hunger remains a problem in America should make every single Member in this Chamber feel ashamed. H.R. 1 gives us a chance to begin to solve this problem and to prevent many more American families from slipping into hunger.

Madam Speaker, as I said at the outset, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act includes large invest-

ments in our infrastructure to help rebuild our roads and our bridges, to help with our water and sewer plants, to help State and local governments deal with the financial burdens and crises they are currently faced with. This is a bill that will help put people back to work and that will create millions of jobs that will hopefully stimulate this economy. The one thing I do know, Madam Speaker, is that doing nothing is not an option. That is what has been happening in the previous administration. They ignored this problem for far too long. And their response when the probably became a huge problem was grossly inadequate.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support this package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my friend from Worcester for yielding me the traditional 30 minutes and I yield myself, as I said, such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we all know that the United States of America is facing one of the greatest challenges we have ever had. This is a very tough and painful time for Americans all across the economic spectrum. People have been losing their homes. We have seen the jobless rate surge. And we have challenging and difficult days ahead of us. Every one has acknowledged that. Conservative, liberal, moderate, wherever you stand on the political spectrum, we all know that we are dealing with extraordinarily difficult times.

I have to say at the outset as my friend went through the litany of challenges that President Barack Obama has now inherited, it is true, we are facing very tough times. But I think it is very important to note that I was privileged to come to this institution in 1981. And when Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, if you look at the numbers that existed in 1980 and 1981, the time of the transition from the Carter administration to the Reagan administration, the inflation rate was 13.5 percent, the unemployment rate was 7.1 percent and interest rates were well into double digits.

Now, no one knows what tomorrow is going to bring. And most people have said that tomorrow is going to be challenging and difficult. And I personally believe that it is. But I think that it is important to note that the challenge which President Obama has inherited and which we, as elected leaders in this country, have inherited is a tough one. But it may or may not be unprecedented.

We do know this. And I'm very pleased that President Obama is at this moment right here in the Capitol meeting with members of the Republican Conference. And I have just come

from that meeting to begin the debate on the issue of the so-called economic stimulus package. President Obama, in his presentation to us, provided a very nice, encouraging message with which I agree. He said that as we deal with this economic stimulus package, let's work as hard as we possibly can to put politics aside.

This is a message that President Obama has carried repeatedly throughout his campaign. And 1 week ago today, as he stood on the west front of the Capitol, he made it very clear that that was that exactly what he wanted to do, was to put politics aside.

□ 1300

Now I will say to my friend that pointing the finger of blame is an unfortunate thing, and I think it is really being political, and that is why I hope very much that we can follow the words of encouragement that President Obama has just given Republican Members, and that is to put politics aside and as we debate this stimulus package, focus on the merits. "Focus on the merits" are the exact words that the President of the United States just used within the last few minutes downstairs.

I believe it is absolutely imperative that we look at the merits. Everyone knows that we need to take action to stimulate our economy, to get people back to work, to help people buy and keep homes, to keep businesses investing, job creating, and to ensure that the very important societal needs that are out there are adequately addressed.

The problem that we have, Madam Speaker, is that as we look at this package that is before us, unfortunately there has not been the kind of bipartisan cooperation that President Obama has encouraged and has personally sought.

As we look at the legislation, the measure that we are going to be working on further today upstairs in the Rules Committee, it is an \$825 billion package. It is an \$825 billion package which, based on the report that was released yesterday from the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, has levels of expending that go not just a year beyond where we are, not just 2 years beyond where we are, but to 10 years. And, Madam Speaker, I know very few Members have recognized this, one of our crack staff members found this out last night in looking at budget authority versus outlays, there is actually \$2.3 billion, according to the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that in this stimulus package is expended beyond 10 years, beyond 2019.

Now again, following the words of encouragement that we as Republican Members have just received from President Obama downstairs focusing on the merits of the stimulus package versus politics is going to be a high priority for us. And that is why, again, this study which just came out from the professional, nonpartisan Congress-

sional Budget Office, remember this is not a Republican publication. Yes, I am a Republican, proud to be a Republican, I am simply reporting to the House, Madam Speaker, what it is that was included in this Congressional Budget Office study which I commend to every single one of our colleagues. I encourage people to look at the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study, and the reason I am focusing on it is I want to share, along with the information that I just provided, that \$2.3 billion of this is actually expended beyond 2019, 10 years from now.

I would like to share a couple of paragraphs from this study. It is on page 4 and this is entitled H.R. 1, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009 as introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday on January 26. It provides a summary. This is, again, from the CBO. It reads: "CBO expects that Federal agencies, along with States and other recipients of the funding, would find it difficult to properly manage and oversee a rapid expansion of existing programs so as to expend the added funds as quickly as they expend the resources provided for their ongoing programs."

This study goes on to say: "Lags in spending stem in part from the need to draft plans, solicit bids, enter into contracts, and conduct regulatory or environmental reviews. Spending can be further delayed because some activities are by their nature seasonal. For example, major school repairs are generally scheduled during the summer to avoid disrupting classes, and construction and highway work are difficult to carry out during the winter months in many parts of the country." It is snowing outside right now. We know that to be the case.

And then, Madam Speaker, this report, not a partisan report from the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office goes on to say: "Brand new programs pose additional challenges. Developing procedures and criteria, issuing the necessary regulations, and reviewing plans and proposals would make distributing money quickly even more difficult—as can be seen, for example, in the lack of any disbursements to date under the loan programs established for automakers last summer to invest in producing energy-efficient vehicles. Throughout the Federal Government, spending for new programs has frequently been slower than expected and rarely been faster."

Madam Speaker, again, these are not my words. There is nothing partisan about this. These words came from the study released yesterday from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. I focus on this because I believe that President Obama was absolutely right 15 minutes ago when he said to Republican Members of this institution that we should focus on the merits and not on politics. We don't want to focus on politics because we know it is absolutely essential that we come together

with a package that will truly stimulate our economy, get Americans working, create jobs and deal with this very serious economic challenge.

Now as we move ahead, Madam Speaker, what needs to be done is we need to have a package that will not do as the Congressional Budget Office, the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has stated, create slow, wasteful, duplicative spending, and that is basically what they are saying here. They are talking about in their independent analysis how difficult it is going to be to get these dollars out there, and to not spend \$2.3 billion of this 11 years from today, we should instead focus on fast acting, immediate action.

Now what is it that we can do to deal with the issue of immediacy that faces us? Well, on the opening day I was pleased to introduce legislation which is included in the alternative package that we are going to bring forward. That legislation is focused on addressing a particular problem that is out there in our economy, and that is the housing industry. Traditionally, the housing industry has played a very important role in reigniting our economy.

Yesterday the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in his testimony before the Rules Committee, said there is no way the housing or the auto industry will be able to play a role in bringing us out of economic recession. And I challenged him on that because I don't believe that is in any way accurate in concluding it because we can take action.

On opening day I introduced legislation which calls for incentivizing Americans to purchase and have an interest in keeping their homes. What it consists of, and we will have this in our package, is a \$7,500 exclusion to help people offset the downpayment they make on their home. Everyone has recognized that a big part of this problem in the housing industry has been the fact that people put absolutely nothing down and had subprime rates of interest. And those subprime rates of interest allowed people, unfortunately, to treat their homes like rental units. So they had no vested interest in it, and so they were actually encouraged to walk away.

If we can say to an American, and we all know that the savings rate has gone up because of these challenging economic times, that they put some dollars aside that actually utilizes that to increase the percentage of their downpayment on that home purchase will play a role in dealing with that inventory of housing that is out there.

We saw the reports of the layoffs at Home Depot and a wide range of other companies yesterday. We know if we are able to encourage people to have a vested interest in their home and purchase their home, that will go a long way towards encouraging responsibility and seeing that they have a vested interest in that home. That is just one example.

We also believe when it comes to tax relief that we should provide tax relief to Americans who pay taxes. That is why in our package we are going to call for an across-the-board cut for every single American, reducing from 10 percent to 5 percent on the first level of income that is taxed.

Action like this, I believe, Madam Speaker, will provide an immediacy which is what the American people want. They want an immediate response. And yes, some spending is necessary. We recognize that infrastructure spending is necessary. But as we look at the litany of items that have been included in this package that in no way stimulate our economy, I believe that we should in fact focus on responsibility, private sector job creation, and economic growth. That, I believe, will mitigate the pain which so many of our fellow Americans are suffering at this moment.

Madam Speaker, because of the direction in which we are headed, I am going to encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule. I recognize it is only a general debate rule, but I am very troubled with the legislation that we have seen, some of the actions that have been taken in the committees of jurisdiction. With that, I am going to urge opposition to this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am all for bipartisanship, but I find it curious that the gentleman is preaching bipartisanship when this morning, and I read from Politico, there is a story that says this morning House minority leader JOHN BOEHNER went for the jugular, urging his members to oppose the economic centerpiece of Obama's first term just hours before the President paid the Republicans the compliment of coming to the Capitol for a private meeting, even before he did the same for House Democrats.

I will yield to the gentleman in just a second.

It seems to me if we want to be bipartisan, then everybody should reserve judgment until all the facts are on the table. I would like to think that the House minority leader would have reserved his judgment on the overall package until he and the Republican Members of this House had an opportunity to hear the new President out. That did not happen.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and let me say that I stand here, having just left the meeting with the President to come up to voice my strong opposition to the \$825 billion package that was unveiled without consultation with the Republican leadership. The partisanship has, unfortunately, been demonstrated through actions of my friend on the other side of

the aisle. So we are seeking opposition to it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, the fact of the matter is the economic downturn is no longer subject to debate. In the last 4 months, the country has lost 2 million jobs and is expected to lose another 3 to 5 million in the next year. This recovery package represents a crucial first step forward in a concerted effort to not only save but create millions of more jobs in this country. This is a defining moment for every single person in this Chamber. We need to act. We need to move forward with something big and bold, and not the same old, same old.

And bipartisanship, Madam Speaker, doesn't mean that Democrats should capitulate to every request that the Republicans make. Bipartisanship doesn't mean that we should embrace policies that have failed in the past, embracing the same old, same old.

Chairman OBEY was before the House Rules Committee last night and talked about the Republican amendments that he accepted during debate on this package in the Appropriations Committee. This is not everything I would like, Madam Speaker. Quite frankly, I think the package needs to be bigger. But this represents, I think, the best judgment of our new President, working with his advisers, and I think this package is a crucial first step forward in trying to bring this economy back from where it is today. This is a crucial step in trying to create millions of more jobs to put people back to work to try to stimulate this economy to get things moving again.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I assume my friend has seen this Congressional Budget Office study, and I want to add, as we talk about this Congressional Budget Office study, that it is important to note that while our friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee talked about his acceptance of amendments, it is fascinating that the Energy and Commerce Committee had a rigorous debate on a number of amendments. They accepted four Republican amendments by voice vote that dealt with things like COBRA qualification, health information technology, the rights of pharmacists, and they dropped those four amendments from the bill. So what kind of bipartisanship is that, I ask my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I would say to my friend that the Congressional Budget Office study report is disputed by many, many on the House Appropriations Committee and many on the Senate Appropriations Committee. In fact, Mark Zandi who is a conservative economist and former adviser to JOHN MCCAIN, your Presidential candidate in the last go-around, projected that this stimulus package would create 4 million jobs by the end

of 2010 and it will provide a vital boost to this lagging economy.

The bottom line is, I think it is obvious that the kind of investments that are in this package, infrastructure, green jobs, investments in education, investments in Food Stamps and investments in medical technology, investments in making sure that we have more nurses and more primary care doctors, all of those things create more jobs and will stimulate the economy.

We can debate reports all we want, but those of us who have been here for awhile know that when you invest in things like infrastructure, you create jobs back home. That is what we are doing here. There are expedited provisions here to make sure that the money gets out quickly.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield at this point 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1315

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN.

I think it is very important for us to get our hands around exactly what the situation is now. Our house is on fire. There are two things we need to do. We got to get the water, and we got to get the water quickly and put this fire out. Our economy is crumbling right before our eyes. We are losing 6,300 homes to foreclosure every day. We are losing almost that many jobs every day. Each day there is a new headline, 5,000 jobs here, 6,000 jobs here. Ladies and gentlemen, we can't wait.

Now, let us talk about this economic recovery and investment package, because that is what it is, and let's be fair and accurate with the American people as we talk. We have a new administration that is saddled with the responsibility of leading and applying the executive decisions. This administration, the Obama administration, has come to Congress, and with them, together, we have put together this package, a package that has a great many things in it because our economy has a great many things in it.

Now, if you want to stimulate the economy, there are only three basic ways to do it: You can cut taxes, which is in here; you can do huge government spending, which is in here; and you can also use the Fed to cut the interest rates, which we have already done and they are frozen at zero. So we are left with these two things. And this package is equally balanced in terms of the impact that is needed. We need to get stimulus in as quickly as we can.

Madam Speaker, if I may just share with you a little letter I received from one of my constituents in a high school in Clayton County in Forest Park. Let me just read this.

It says, "Dear Congressman Scott. I am a high school student that attends Forest Park High School here in Clayton County, Georgia. This school is in bad shape and I hope you can help us get money for the school. The school needs new tile for restrooms and new

windows. The hallways need new lockers so that the lockers that don't open can be replaced. Classrooms need new desks so that some of the desks that have graffiti and old gum stuck to them can be replaced. We need more space in the lunchroom. Congressman Scott, the lines are so long in the lunchroom that when some students just get their food, it is time for them to go back to the classroom."

Well, in this package we have \$43 million into this Clayton County school system. In another county in my district, \$50 million. And I am sure every Member of this House can get a letter saying the same thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, our country is riveted with those moments that try men's souls. We are at such a moment in our history. And when the history books are written on this moment, let it be said that both Republicans and Democrats came together and responded at this moment with the confidence that the American people are looking to us with a way out of this dilemma that we are in. That is why they elected us, to lead, to lead with confidence and with boldness, and to rise to the occasion of this moment that tries men's souls as those moments in our past history from the foundation of this country to now have.

Let us move with quick dispatch and get this measure off, passed and over to President Obama, so he can execute this plan immediately.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to say to my good friend from Clayton County, Georgia, who does a spectacular job, that we all want to ensure that schools and the other very pressing needs out there are addressed. Getting our economy growing is critical for that and I know my friend concurs with the importance for us to do that, and that is why I point to this independent, professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office study which has indicated that there is going to be a tremendous lag time in getting those resources to those schools to which my friend has referred.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Moore, Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee from California for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation. Let me say at the outset, I respect the Rules Committee and the very important function that it carries out as a former member, but it is preeminently, as it should be, the Speaker's committee. In this case I believe the Speaker has presented us with legislation in a format that is unlikely to receive significant minority support and participation,

and, frankly, that is unfortunate, Madam Speaker, because I think it is avoidable.

There is much in the current situation that, frankly, the two parties in this body agree on. We agree that we are in a serious recession. We agree that dramatic Federal response is required to deal with job loss and the mounting economic challenges we face. We agree that tax cuts are an important part of that solution. We have some disagreement over which ones and how much, but clearly it is an area we can find common ground on.

We agree that infrastructure is important to moving us forward, although I regret there is very little of this bill, frankly, that deals with infrastructure. Less than 10 percent in total actually goes to infrastructure spending. I think that is something we could find common ground on and enlarge. We disagree, quite obviously, over a whole range of other spending issues which constitute over half the bill.

In our opinion, the spending is simply too much. There are too many new programs that have not been authorized and gone through the appropriate committee process. There is unsustainable spending in this program, things like Pell Grants and IDEA money that is good, but frankly will ramp up and then immediately crash down. Or we will set ourselves up for a future tax increase, which I don't think anybody, certainly on my side of the aisle, is anxious to do. So there are areas of agreement and disagreement.

Madam Speaker, it is not too late to find common ground. We could defeat this rule and ask the Rules Committee to send us back three items that we could consider sequentially and separately. We could root out the bad programs. We could find common ground. We could find common ground on tax cuts. We can find common ground on infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the former Rules Committee member and a great appropriator, an additional minute.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

We could then have our disagreements over the spending portion of the bill. We could vote on each of these items separately. They could later be merged and sent on as a separate bill. In that process we would find significant bipartisan participation and agreement. But, unfortunately, the rule under which we are likely to bring the legislation to the floor is going to make that impossible and give us the old partisan debates that the country would like to see us move past.

So I would ask my colleagues to reject this rule and ask my capable friends on the Rules Committee in both parties to go back and to give us the type of process and the type of bill that will yield a bipartisan outcome, a bipartisan victory. That is what the

country wants, that is what America needs, that is what the President has asked us to do. That is what we are capable of doing if we will address this matter in the appropriate manner.

So I urge the rejection of this rule and the beginning of a bipartisan process where we can find so much common ground.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for the previous speaker, who I had the pleasure of serving with on the Rules Committee for many years, but what we seem to be hearing over and over from the other side is they care about job loss, but. They care about the survival of small businesses, but. They care about the fact that hunger is a growing problem in America, but. They care about the infrastructure, but.

Well, "but" nothing. The time has come, because things are so bad, and we don't have to argue about how we got here, but the reality is I think there is a consensus that we are in a serious economic meltdown right now and that in fact we need to do something. We need to do something big and bold. We need to try to jump-start this economy.

This may not be all that needs to be done, quite frankly, but the fact is, if you care about infrastructure, you need to support a bill that spends and invests in infrastructure. If you care about job losses in this country, then you have got to do something other than just talk about it, and invest in programs that will help create more jobs. If you care about the fact that hunger is a growing problem in the United States of America, which is shameful, then you need to do something that will not only help feed hungry people, but stimulate the economy. And this bill does that, and more.

So there are lots of things in this bill that I think will stimulate this economy. We could all find something that we don't like. But the fact of the matter is, if everybody had the opportunity to write this bill, there would be 435 different bills. This bill I think represents the best judgment of the new President of the United States, working with the Democratic leadership and working with Members in this House, and I think it deserves support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Well, how we got in this situation is that ideology triumphed over reason. For the last eight years, and a little longer, we have been told that there are few problems in America that can't be solved other than by more tax breaks and a permissive attitude toward corporate law enforcement. Now we have the results, the Bush recession, and if we don't pass this legislation it will soon become the Bush depression.

Now, the real question we need to be asking is, "how do we get the biggest

bang for the buck?" We want to be concerned about every single one of these taxpayer dollars, that they do the most possible to ensure an economic recovery. And one of the people that we have turned to is a principal economic adviser to Senator JOHN MCCAIN and his presidential campaign.

He, like other economists, has analyzed the provisions of this bill, and he has told us that we will add to our gross domestic product \$1.72 for every 1 dollar that we spend in this bill on food stamps to help hungry people in this country. He also told us that on some of the corporate loss carryback provisions, we will get only 19 cents added per dollar spent, and that with a permanent corporate tax cut, as some have advocated, we will get only 30 cents for every dollar we invest.

I think we need to focus our attention where it does the most good in order to ensure an economic recovery for families across our country.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. On your time, later.

Mr. DREIER. I will yield time to you if you will agree to yield for a question here.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me give an example of what this bill does with regard to one provision in this bill that I was involved in writing that deals with the illegal action of the Secretary of the Treasury under President Bush, Mr. Paulson, to just suspend the law that President Ronald Reagan signed so that corporations wouldn't go out and dodge their taxes by taking over some other corporation's tax losses. Secretary Paulson suspended that law without any legal basis for banks in this country, and some have estimated that could result in a drain on the Treasury of \$140 billion. This bill closes that loophole.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. On your time.

Mr. DREIER. I will be happy to yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, if he will yield.

Mr. DOGGETT. May I have regular order and may I be assured that I have my full minute to discuss what I want to discuss?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will suspend.

The gentleman from California, the gentleman from Texas has been recognized.

Mr. DREIER. I just yielded him an additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is great. I have got an additional minute yielded here and a minute there. Which, Madam Speaker, may I take first?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. All right, I yield for 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I simply wanted to engage in a little debate here, if I might, and that is the reason I yielded time to my friend, so that we could ask the question as to whether or not the gentleman has looked at the Congressional Budget Office study, the professional, non-partisan Congressional Budget Office Study.

Mr. DOGGETT. Not only looked at it, but I heard testimony all this morning in the Budget Committee.

Mr. DREIER. If I could complete my thought, my question is, have you in fact looked at the professional, non-partisan CBO study that came out last night talking about the slowness with which we will have to contend at getting these resources? And I agree with my friend on the need to try and get it in, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have not only looked at the report, but I have spent most of the morning listening to the testimony of Dr. Elmendorf, who wrote that report, and indeed it is from that very report that the kind of language that I was referring to earlier, some of the proposals that you are advocating, are the ones that are the least effective for getting our recovery going, and that is why I think we have a blended proposal here. But some of the changes you want are not efficient. They are a weak way of getting recovery, and we should be focused on the biggest bang for the buck.

Now, let me focus on the minute that the gentleman from Massachusetts was kind enough to yield to me, because there is one provision in this bill that I think is very important. It is \$13.5 billion in additional assistance to many working families, many middle-class families, concerning higher education.

□ 1330

This was not in the bill as originally proposed by President Obama and his advisers, but he said, as he is saying to Republicans, I'm sure, right now, "If you've got a better idea, I'm open to it." And in this case, the better idea was an idea he advanced in the campaign that we need to do more, particularly at a time of economic downturn, to get more of our young people and perhaps not so young people back into community colleges, into higher education institutions across this country.

What this tax credit will do, in addition to the important increase in Pell grants in this bill, is to provide a refundable credit to many working families of up to \$1,000, up to \$2,500 to other families that will for the first time cover textbooks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. This credit will for the first time cover textbooks, will supplement Pell grants, will provide a

real opportunity not only for individuals to retool their skills but in the process retool our whole economy with a better trained workforce.

I think this is a very effective way to address economic recovery. I'm pleased it has been incorporated in this bill. There is not a family that has a stake in higher education, trying to get someone into a higher education institution, or who has someone there now that is not likely to gain, middle-class families, working families, from this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will say that I truly do believe that we are making an attempt to follow the directive that was provided to us within the last hour by President Obama in his address to the Republican Conference when he talked about the need to focus on merits rather than politics here.

We are, in fact, offering an alternative. We are, in fact, saying that we believe that encouraging private sector growth and, yes, putting into place spending that will help to develop our infrastructure is important. So we acknowledge that.

The fact is if you look at what Ronald Reagan inherited in 1981, as I was saying in my opening remarks, an inflation rate of 13½ percent, interest rates that were beyond 15 percent, an unemployment rate that was in excess of 7 percent, what was it that was done the last time that we faced a challenge that, quite frankly, according to the numbers as of right now was even greater than it is today? What was the response, in a bipartisan way, of Democrats and Republicans alike? And I remember very vividly as we did this in May of 1981 and August of 1981. What happened, Madam Speaker, we put into place a package that restrained the rate of growth of Federal Government, cutting by 17 percent the rate of growth of Federal spending. That was done in May of 1981, known as the Gramm-Latta budget package. Then in August of 1981, the bipartisan Conable-Hance economic growth package brought about a broad across-the-board marginal rate reduction which tripled the flow of revenues to the Federal Government as it unleashed tremendous economic growth.

So, Madam Speaker, this notion that we are saying we are for small business but, we are for all these other things but, as my friend from Worcester has said just a few minutes ago, is preposterous. We have a very, very strong and positive track record on what needs to be done to get this economy growing. We have the ability to do that. And I believe that President Obama is sincere when he says we need to talk about the merits and not the politics.

Again, looking at 1981, when a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle joined in a bipartisan way to do this, that is the prescription for the challenges that we face today. It worked then, and I believe very strongly that it can work now. Encouraging

individual initiative and responsibility, stepping forward with ways in which we can help these industries that have been suffering greatly is something that can be done. And when this study that was done by the Congressional Budget Office made it very clear that in this package that has been brought before us, without consultation with the Republican leadership, without consultation with the Republican leadership, we are, in fact, expending dollars which will be slow and wasteful; and, Madam Speaker, we're expending dollars more than 10 years from now in this package.

So I will agree with my friends on the other side of the aisle we are never going to come to a perfect agreement, but I believe we should use what has, in fact, worked in the past in generating real economic growth.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's history lesson about Ronald Reagan and about what happened in 1981. I wasn't here in 1981. I was a senior in college, but I appreciate the gentleman's giving me that history lesson.

But when he talks about the strong track record of the Republicans, I beg to differ. I think the American people differ. That's what the outcome of this election was about. People do not want more of the same. They're tired of the Republican track record. They want to go in a very different direction.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the economic recovery legislation before us today.

My own State, New York, has been hard hit by the recession. The collapse of the markets on Wall Street have left gaping revenue holes that have contributed to our \$15.4 billion State budget deficit.

In this economic crisis, high unemployment and rising costs have put a huge strain on many American families. This legislation contains a series of programs to provide relief, including helping workers train and find jobs, extending unemployment benefits, and increasing food stamp benefits.

I'm so proud that we will protect health care coverage for millions of Americans during this recession by providing an estimated \$87 billion in additional Federal matching funds. This will help States like New York maintain our Medicaid programs in the face of massive State budget shortfalls over the next 2 years. I have long fought hard for increased F-MAP funds and am grateful that the stimulus will provide some much-needed relief to our States as they struggle to maintain access to needed services. And as we marked up the bill last week in the Energy and Commerce Committee, I was

very, very proud that we had the monies in this bill.

We will also reduce our dependence on foreign oil by making investments aimed at dramatically increasing renewable energy production and renovating public buildings to make them more energy efficient. In this bill we will invest wisely in U.S. development of advanced vehicle batteries and battery systems through loans and grants so that America can lead the world in transforming the way automobiles are powered. We will also have tax credits for private homeowners for new furnaces, energy-efficient windows and doors, and insulation.

So this is a great bill, and, Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am going to try again, Madam Speaker. I know that my friend who was a senior in college when I began my service here in the institution, I appreciate his reminding me of how much older I am than he, although I have to tell him I was not too much older than he when he was a senior in college and I was proud to begin my service here.

The fact is, okay, I've talked about Ronald Reagan. And I know my friend is from Worcester, and he's very proud of that, and what I would like to do is talk about John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States from his State.

In 1961 we all know John F. Kennedy became President. He did a lot of great things. He's been a model for Democrats and Republicans alike in so many areas. There were challenging economic times in the early 1960s, and John F. Kennedy did exactly what Ronald Reagan did in 1981, and my friend describes this as the "same old, same old."

Well, I believe that it's imperative for us to recognize the best way to get our economy growing. Not only Ronald Reagan but John F. Kennedy recognized it and put into place policies that unleashed the kind of economic growth to which we all aspire today. We know that it's been done many times throughout world history and it can happen.

So if my friend wants to criticize the gentleman from his State, President Kennedy, just as he criticizes Ronald Reagan for the same old, same old, Madam Speaker, I welcome his doing that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, they never said our task and our job would be easy. I imagine when the Founding Fathers were trying to create this great Union, it was not easy

then as well. But we have a responsibility and a duty. We have taken an oath of office. We have a responsibility to the American people.

Our President has offered a solution. That is why we are here. And I rise to support the rule and the underlying bill because I am looking for an economic engine that will actually roll across America's railways, that will go into the hamlets and villages and communities where people are depressed and oppressed. And, frankly, there are items that I think answer the question whether or not we are concerned about creating jobs.

The increase of the earned income tax credit is one that we have seen work and can work. I have worked with John Hope Bryant, who chairs an organization dealing with financial literacy. We saw the impact of the earned income tax credit for Hurricane Katrina families, for working families, and that has been increased. For those who are seeking homes, we don't want to kill off the homeowners market, and we see now that the \$7,500 tax credit that had to be repaid in 15 years will now be waived and forgiven. We can get homeowners or home purchasers into homes, which Americans would like to do.

We will be seeing \$20 billion for school modernization, \$14 billion for K-12, and \$6 billion for higher education institutions. We will also be seeing moneys going for educational technology grants. But my school districts are already lining up to be able to create that economic engine to keep teachers at work and to train the next generation of workers.

There are green jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

There is more infusion of Medicaid dollars so that those who are uninsured will have the resources necessary to be able to, in essence, provide for their family but keep looking for work.

This is a calling of crisis. And so with the green jobs, the infrastructure, I do support this rule, but I would certainly like to see the mark of the transportation and infrastructure go from \$9 billion to \$12 billion. I would like to see the language of "use it or lose it" be restored. I want to make sure that the metro system of Houston can fall under the transit funding. And we're going to be working with the chairman of the Transportation Committee and our congressional delegation because these will create jobs across America. I want to see rail travel restored. I want to make sure the infrastructure of America is rebuilt. I want the bridges in the 18th Congressional District enrolled rebuilt by the hands and labor of the American people. That's what this stimulus is about.

There is no doubt that if we stand on this floor of the House or the other

body and ignore the cry of Americans, we too can hold our heads in shame.

Support this rule and support this legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I think that it's become very clear in this debate that we all recognize the fact that there is a great deal of suffering going on here in the United States of America. Our constituents are hurting. We are dealing with a very, very challenging economic downturn, and we all want to come together to try to find a way to jumpstart our economy.

President Obama has, just a few minutes ago, completed an address to the Republican Conference, Republican Members of this institution, and he went over to meet with our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol. And the words that really struck me that he offered to us were that as we deal with this economic stimulus package, Madam Speaker, it's important for us to focus on merits and not politics. Merits and not politics. And I completely concur with that. I completely concur with that. And, again, it was 1 week ago today that we were all privileged to be on the west front of the Capitol as we were able to witness history and we heard a similar message put forward by President Obama.

□ 1345

That's why, as we move ahead on this issue, we are going to expend our time and our effort focusing on the merits and what needs to be done to get our economy growing.

We know that there is going to be some very important government spending stimulus, and we support things like infrastructure spending, because we know that goods movement, as the economy starts to grow, is imperative, and it needs to be addressed. And so, yes, we support the kind of infrastructure spending that we have talked about.

But, Madam Speaker, as we look at the analysis that has been done on this \$825 billion package, it doesn't do what is essential. I believe that we need to make sure that every dollar expended gets into, on track, just as quickly as we possibly can. We all want to try and move that. President Obama has already talked about shovel-ready projects. We understand the imperative of this.

Unfortunately, the study that has been provided by the professional, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has made it very clear that it is virtually impossible for us to achieve that goal with this package that has been put before us. In fact, Madam Speaker, in looking at the spending, it's not just beyond a year or 2 years, and the President in his remarks downstairs talked about the fact that he wanted us to get—maybe not within this year, but within the next 2 years—this spending out.

Yet, Madam Speaker, based on this professional, nonpartisan Congress-

sional Budget Office study again, not a Republican statement, \$2.3 billion of this package won't be expended until 2019. That's more than 10 years today, and that's what the CBO study has said, and I would commend that to all of our colleagues.

What is it that needs to be done? We need to recognize that bold, strong, decisive, across-the-board marginal rate cuts, doing everything we can to encourage individual initiative and responsibility, is the kind of legislative action that we here can take to get our economy growing and, as we discussed, as the President has said, the merits of this, unfortunately, we don't do that in this package.

That is the reason, Madam Speaker, that we will be coming forward with an alternative, an alternative, a very positive alternative that brings about marginal rate reduction for 100 percent, 100 percent of American taxpayers, so that they can save and invest. And we, of course, want to encourage consumption. We, of course, want to encourage the steps that are necessary to get our economy growing.

I would say again, the idea of incentivizing people to get off the couch and into showrooms of automobile dealerships, the idea of having people take responsibility and being incentivized to make a greater down payment on a home so that they will have a vested interest in it and not this very, very, very failed zero down payment and subprime rates of interest, these are the kinds of creative, bold, policies that we can put into place. That's what we want to do as we deal with the suffering that is out there.

I am convinced, Madam Speaker, based on the last half century and looking at the policies of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan, that if we were to do that, we would do exactly what happened following the implementation of those policies by both John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan in the 1960s and the 1980s. We will boost the economy, increase the flow of Federal revenues to the Treasury and be able to address the challenges that are before us.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, because the underlying legislation itself is very, very badly flawed, and it's not what the American people need.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me begin by thanking Chairmen OBEY, RANGEL, WAXMAN, OBERSTAR, MILLER, SPRATT and GORDON for their incredible work on this package, and I want to thank their staffs.

I also want to thank ROSA DELAUNO for championing the antihunger provisions in this package, which I think are so important, not only in terms of our moral obligation to help people in this country who don't have enough to eat, but it also helps stimulate the economy.

I also am grateful to Majority Leader STENY HOYER and to Speaker NANCY

PELOSI for their leadership in trying to put a good and solid reinvestment recovery package together.

Madam Speaker, we are facing extremely tough times. This economy is in the worst shape since the Great Depression. Millions and millions of people have lost their jobs and millions more will lose their jobs unless this Congress, working with this President, takes decisive action.

We are not talking about statistics, we are talking about people. We are talking about families, and they are hurting. There is not a single one of us in this chamber who, when we go home, do not encounter people who have lost their jobs or who are on the verge of losing their jobs.

People are struggling, people are fearful. Small businesses are struggling. They are asking for our help. Cities and towns and States are facing the worst financial crisis in decades, and they are looking for help.

The underlying bill before us provides a first step in helping remedy this terrible situation. John F. Kennedy liked to say that a rising tide lifts all boats. Well, that is what we are trying to do with this package.

We are trying to stimulate the economy. We are trying to make sure that everybody, not just the few who are rich, but everybody, those who are in the middle class and those who are poor, gets the help that they deserve.

My colleague talked about a substitute that the Republicans will offer. Well, that's great, and they will have an opportunity to debate and make their substitute and let the votes fall where they may. But the fact of the matter is that I personally believe that their approach, which I referred to as the same old same old, will not prevail. I hope it doesn't prevail. That's what this election was about. People do not want more of the same. They want a different direction.

Quite frankly, this stimulus package that we debated today should have been what President Bush asked for a year ago. We are late in coming to rescue so many families across this country.

I know it's fashionable on the other side to talk about tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. The bill that President Obama and the Democratic leadership are putting together, 95 percent of American taxpayers get a break.

But I should tell my colleagues that for every dollar of direct spending, the economy gets \$1.50 in stimulus. Every dollar of tax cut produces 75 cents in economic stimulus. So I do think, while we can make the argument that tax cuts are important, investment in our infrastructure, investment in our schools, investment in our economy, is incredibly important.

People have said, well, there is no way we can get all this money out. I should point out in this bill there are strict accountability measures to ensure that highways and transit funds get out of the door quickly to create

jobs. It requires States to obligate 50 percent of the highway and transit funding within 180 days, or the Transportation Department can reclaim some of the States' highway and transportation funding in the bill. So there are incentives to get this money out quickly to help stimulate this economy.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me say that this really is a defining moment. People are looking to their government for help. They are looking for us to take big, bold steps. They are looking at us the same way that people looked at Franklin Roosevelt during the Great Depression to come and try to put together a package to help get people back to work.

Well, that's what we're trying to do here. Madam Speaker, I will say this, I am proud to be on the floor today debating this rule which will pave the way for a debate on this Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act, because it shows that this government, once again, has a conscience.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 26

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, January 28, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 2, 2009, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 4, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 9, 2009, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker or her designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as she may designate if, in her opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 87; adopting House Resolution 87; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 88; and adopting House Resolution 88.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 181, LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 87, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 175, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper

Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt

Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon

Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall

Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space

NAYS—175

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Brown-Waite,
Ginny

McCollum
Solis (CA)
Tiberi
Young (AK)

□ 1421

Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Messrs. REHBERG and GOODLATTE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. NYE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 174, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—252

Abercrombie	Edwards (MD)	Lewis (GA)
Ackerman	Edwards (TX)	Lipinski
Adler (NJ)	Ellison	Loeb
Altmire	Ellsworth	Loeb
Andrews	Engel	Lowe
Arcuri	Eshoo	Lujan
Baca	Etheridge	Lynch
Baird	Farr	Maffei
Baldwin	Fattah	Maloney
Barrow	Filner	Markey (CO)
Bean	Foster	Markey (MA)
Becerra	Frank (MA)	Marshall
Berkley	Fudge	Massa
Berman	Giffords	Matheson
Berry	Gonzalez	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Gordon (TN)	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Grayson	McCollum
Blumenauer	Green, Al	McDermott
Boccieri	Green, Gene	McGovern
Boren	Griffith	McIntyre
Boswell	Grijalva	McMahon
Boucher	Gutierrez	McNerney
Boyd	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)
Brady (PA)	Halvorson	Meeks (NY)
Braley (IA)	Hare	Melancon
Bright	Harman	Michaud
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Butterfield	Heinrich	Miller, George
Capps	Hereth Sandlin	Minnick
Capuano	Higgins	Mitchell
Cardoza	Hill	Mollohan
Carnahan	Himes	Moore (KS)
Carney	Hinche	Moore (WI)
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Castor (FL)	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Chandler	Hodes	Murphy, Patrick
Childers	Holden	Murtha
Clarke	Holt	Nadler (NY)
Clay	Honda	Napolitano
Cleaver	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Clyburn	Inslee	Nye
Cohen	Israel	Oberstar
Connolly (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Cooper	(TX)	Ortiz
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Courtney	Kagen	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Kanjorski	Payne
Cuellar	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Cummings	Kennedy	Perriello
Dahlkemper	Kildee	Peters
Davis (AL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kilroy	Pingree (ME)
Davis (IL)	Kind	Polis (CO)
Davis (TN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pomeroy
DeFazio	Kissell	Price (NC)
DeGette	Klein (FL)	Rahall
Delahunt	Kosmas	Rangel
DeLauro	Kratovil	Reyes
Dicks	Kucinich	Richardson
Dingell	Langevin	Rodriguez
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Doyle	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Driehaus	Levin	Rush

Ryan (OH)	Skelton
Salazar	Slaughter
Sanchez, Linda T.	Smith (WA)
Sanchez, Loretta	Snyder
Sarbanes	Space
Schakowsky	Speier
Schauer	Spratt
Schiff	Stark
Schrader	Stupak
Schwartz	Sutton
Scott (GA)	Tanner
Scott (VA)	Tauscher
Serrano	Taylor
Sestak	Teague
Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)
Sherman	Thompson (MS)
Shuler	Tierney
Sires	Titus
	Tonko

NAYS—174

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Akin	Gallely	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Austria	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Nunes
Bachus	Gohmert	Olson
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Paul
Bartlett	Granger	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Graves	Pence
Biggart	Guthrie	Petri
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harper	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Heller	Posey
Blunt	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Boehner	Herger	Putnam
Bonner	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Bono Mack	Hunter	Rehberg
Boozman	Inglis	Reichert
Boustany	Issa	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Jones	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Rooney
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	King (NY)	Roskam
Calvert	Kingston	Royce
Camp	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Campbell	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Cantor	Lamborn	Schmidt
Cao	Lance	Schock
Capito	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Carter	LaTourette	Sessions
Cassidy	Latta	Shadegg
Castle	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Coble	Linder	Simpson
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Cole	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Souder
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel E.	Stearns
Davis (KY)		Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Mack	Terry
Dent	Manzullo	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCaul	Tiahrt
Dreier	McClintock	Turner
Duncan	McCotter	Upton
Ehlers	McHenry	Walden
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
Fallin	McKeon	Westmoreland
Flake	McMorris	Whitfield
Fleming	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Mica	Wittman
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Fox	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	

NOT VOTING—6

Brown-Waite,	Ruppersberger	Young (AK)
Ginny	Solis (CA)	
Marchant	Tiberi	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Less than 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING JACK KELLIHER ON 30 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. I want to recognize and pay tribute to a person, Madam Speaker, who has dedicated 30 years of service to his government, John Francis Kelliher, Jr., or Jack, as he is known, Deputy Sergeant at Arms for police services and congressional relations in House offices. How many of you know the true extent of his contribution to our work and the activity that takes place in and around this Chamber?

Please allow me to introduce a person who, to most of us, needs no introduction. Newer Members may not be as aware of this very special person that we honor today, a true gentleman the rest of us have come to respect and admire.

Jack began his career on the Hill as a member of the Capitol Police force soon after arriving from his native Boston. During his 8½ years on the force, Jack took part in thwarting two incidents which easily could have escalated into very serious breaches of House security.

After leaving the police force, Jack spent the next 12½ years in Chamber security, a unit under the direction of the House Sergeant at Arms charged with securing access to the House Chamber and the area immediately surrounding it. Most of us have come to know him in that capacity. More recently, Jack has held the titles of Assistant Sergeant at Arms and “Keeper of the Mace,” a position of trust he has maintained with honor and with his customary dignity and dependability.

His decision to leave us is received with mixed emotions. He is leaving on his own terms. Wouldn't we all want that to happen as well? Jack and his lovely wife, Nancy, have decided to make St. Augustine, Florida, their new home. It is a decision I'm certain their two children, John and Tara, support wholeheartedly. Free vacations in Florida for life.

It's always tough to say goodbye, Jack. We know we will miss you, but he has decided to leave, and we all wish him well. His parents, John and Elizabeth, would be so proud of him today, as we are for his embodiment of all that is good in the service of his country. Thank you, personally, Jack. And may God bless you and your family as you embark on this new adventure.

Now get out of this cold and run to the sun.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the Honorable ZACH WAMP from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to rise on behalf of all Republicans in the House to honor Jack Kelliher. Jack, if you would please, while I'm speaking, I would ask for you to stand so that everyone in the House can see you.

I just want to say, Madam Speaker, briefly, when we honor you today, Jack, we honor all of the extraordinary support staff and professionals that serve the United States House of Representatives because you represent the finest of them through your 30 years of service. Most of us don't know, he is not just Jack Kelliher, he could be our Jack Bauer. He pulled, at one point as a Capitol police officer, a bomber from the gallery. He has a distinguished history of valor and patriotic service at the highest level. And he is the Keeper of the Mace and Assistant Sergeant at Arms.

Sitting next to him is Joyce Hamlett, who will take his place full time. She is my best friend here in the House. We love Joyce.

We are grateful for Jack. As was said, I have had more laughs in the last 15 years with Jack out on the balcony than just about anybody in the House. He is a good-natured man and a man of extraordinary commitment to our country. We will sorely miss him. In St. Augustine a number of years ago they bought a little place not on the beach but just off the beach. And it is where he goes to get away from us. And we won't follow you there, Jack. We want you and Nancy to enjoy those days and come back to see us. But know every minute how grateful every man and woman in the U.S. House of Representatives is for your service to our country, Jack. Thank you and we honor you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 88, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 183, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—244

Abercrombie	Becerra	Bright
Ackerman	Berkley	Brown, Corrine
Adler (NJ)	Berman	Butterfield
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Baca	Boccheri	Carnahan
Baird	Boren	Carney
Baldwin	Boucher	Carson (IN)
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bean	Braley (IA)	Chandler

Childers	Jackson-Lee	Peters
Clarke	(TX)	Pingree (ME)
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Polis (CO)
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kagen	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kanjorski	Rahall
Connolly (VA)	Kaptur	Rangel
Conyers	Kennedy	Reyes
Cooper	Kildee	Richardson
Costa	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rodriguez
Costello	Kilroy	Ross
Courtney	Kind	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Rush
Dahlkemper	Kosmas	Ryan (OH)
Davis (AL)	Kratovil	Salazar
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (IL)	Langevin	T.
Davis (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Levin	Schauer
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Dicks	Lipinski	Schrader
Dingell	Loeb sack	Schwartz
Doggett	Loftgren, Zoe	Scott (GA)
Donnelly (IN)	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Lujan	Serrano
Driehaus	Lynch	Sestak
Edwards (MD)	Maffei	Shea-Porter
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Sherman
Ellison	Markey (CO)	Sires
Ellsworth	Markey (MA)	Skelton
Engel	Marshall	Slaughter
Eshoo	Massa	Smith (WA)
Etheridge	Matheson	Snyder
Farr	Matsui	Space
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
Finer	McCollum	Spratt
Foster	McDermott	Stark
Frank (MA)	McGovern	Stupak
Fudge	McIntyre	Sutton
Giffords	McMahon	Tanner
Gonzalez	McNerney	Tauscher
Gordon (TN)	Meek (FL)	Teague
Grayson	Meeke (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Green, Al	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Green, Gene	Miller (NC)	Tierney
Griffith	Miller, George	Titus
Grijalva	Mitchell	Tonko
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Towns
Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Tsongas
Halvorson	Moore (WI)	Van Hollen
Hare	Moran (VA)	Velázquez
Harman	Murphy (CT)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Walz
Heinrich	Murtha	Wasserman
Herseht Sandlin	Nadler (NY)	Schultz
Higgins	Napolitano	Waters
Himes	Neal (MA)	Watson
Hinche	Nye	Watt
Hinojosa	Oberstar	Waxman
Hirono	Obey	Weiner
Hodes	Olver	Welch
Holden	Ortiz	Wexler
Holt	Pallone	Wilson (OH)
Honda	Pascrell	Woolsey
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Wu
Inslee	Payne	Yarmuth
Israel	Perlmutter	
Jackson (IL)	Perriello	

NAYS—183

Aderholt	Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Akin	Buchanan	Dreier
Alexander	Burgess	Duncan
Austria	Burton (IN)	Ehlers
Bachmann	Buyer	Emerson
Bachus	Calvert	Fallin
Barrett (SC)	Camp	Flake
Bartlett	Campbell	Fleming
Barton (TX)	Cantor	Forbes
Berry	Cao	Fortenberry
Biggert	Capito	Fox
Bilbray	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Castle	Gale
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Garrett (NJ)
Blunt	Coble	Gerlach
Boehner	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Bonner	Cole	Gohmert
Bono Mack	Conaway	Goodlatte
Boozman	Crenshaw	Granger
Bowen	Culbertson	Graves
Boustany	Davis (KY)	Guthrie
Boyd	Deal (GA)	Hall (TX)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Harper
Brown (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)

Heller	McClintock	Rooney
Hensarling	McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen
Herger	McHenry	Roskam
Hill	McHugh	Royce
Hoekstra	McKeon	Ryan (WI)
Hunter	McMorris	Scalise
Inglis	Rodgers	Schmidt
Issa	Mica	Schock
Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (IL)	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Miller, Gary	Shadegg
Jones	Minnick	Shimkus
Jordan (OH)	Moran (KS)	Shuler
King (IA)	Murphy, Tim	Simpson
King (NY)	Myrick	Smith (NE)
Kingston	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Kirk	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Kline (MN)	Olson	Souder
Lamborn	Paul	Stearns
Lance	Paulsen	Sullivan
Latham	Pence	Taylor
LaTourette	Peterson	Terry
Latta	Petri	Thompson (PA)
Lee (NY)	Pitts	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Tiahrt
Linder	Poe (TX)	Turner
LoBiondo	Posey	Upton
Lucas	Price (GA)	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Putnam	Wamp
Lummis	Radanovich	Westmoreland
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg	Whitfield
E.	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Mack	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Manzullo	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	
McCaul	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—5

Brown-Waite,	Melancon	Tiberi
Ginny	Solis (CA)	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1446

Mr. SHULER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie	Capps	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Capuano	Davis (TN)
Adler (NJ)	Cardoza	DeFazio
Altmire	Carnahan	DeGette
Andrews	Carson (IN)	Delahunt
Arcuri	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Baca	Chandler	Dicks
Baird	Childers	Dingell
Baldwin	Clarke	Doggett
Barrow	Clay	Doyle
Bean	Cleaver	Driehaus
Becerra	Clyburn	Edwards (MD)
Berkley	Cohen	Edwards (TX)
Berman	Connolly (VA)	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Ellsworth
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Engel
Blumenauer	Costello	Eshoo
Boccheri	Courtney	Etheridge
Boren	Crowley	Farr
Boucher	Cuellar	Fattah
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Finer
Braley (IA)	Dahlkemper	Foster
Brown, Corrine	Davis (AL)	Frank (MA)
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Fudge

Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch

Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berry
Biggert
Blibray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle

Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaull
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh

Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaull
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh

McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey

Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Massa

Solis (CA)
Tiberi
Waxman

Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining on this vote.

□ 1458

Mr. ROSS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ON INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(a) of rule X, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker named the following Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 111th Congress:

Mr. GENE GREEN, Texas
Mr. SCOTT, Virginia

□ 1500

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2009.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I designate the following Member to be available for service on the investigative subcommittee of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct during the 111th Congress: The Honorable Doc Hastings of Washington.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT OF 2009

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to H. Res. 87, I call up the Senate bill (S. 181) to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 181

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Supreme Court in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, 550 U.S. 618 (2007), significantly impairs statutory protections against discrimination in compensation that Congress established and that have been bedrock principles of American law for decades. The *Ledbetter* decision undermines those statutory protections by unduly restricting the time period in which victims of discrimination can challenge and recover for discriminatory compensation decisions or other practices, contrary to the intent of Congress.

(2) The limitation imposed by the Court on the filing of discriminatory compensation claims ignores the reality of wage discrimination and is at odds with the robust application of the civil rights laws that Congress intended.

(3) With regard to any charge of discrimination under any law, nothing in this Act is intended to preclude or limit an aggrieved person's right to introduce evidence of an unlawful employment practice that has occurred outside the time for filing a charge of discrimination.

(4) Nothing in this Act is intended to change current law treatment of when pension distributions are considered paid.

SEC. 3. DISCRIMINATION IN COMPENSATION BECAUSE OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.

Section 706(e) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3)(A) For purposes of this section, an unlawful employment practice occurs, with respect to discrimination in compensation in violation of this title, when a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice is adopted, when an individual becomes subject to a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, or when an individual is affected by application of a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, including each time wages, benefits, or other compensation is paid, resulting in whole or in part from such a decision or other practice.

“(B) In addition to any relief authorized by section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42

U.S.C. 1981a), liability may accrue and an aggrieved person may obtain relief as provided in subsection (g)(1), including recovery of back pay for up to two years preceding the filing of the charge, where the unlawful employment practices that have occurred during the charge filing period are similar or related to unlawful employment practices with regard to discrimination in compensation that occurred outside the time for filing a charge.”.

SEC. 4. DISCRIMINATION IN COMPENSATION BECAUSE OF AGE.

Section 7(d) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 626(d)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(B) by striking “(d)” and inserting “(d)(1)”;

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “Upon” and inserting the following:

“(2) Upon”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) For purposes of this section, an unlawful practice occurs, with respect to discrimination in compensation in violation of this Act, when a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice is adopted, when a person becomes subject to a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, or when a person is affected by application of a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, including each time wages, benefits, or other compensation is paid, resulting in whole or in part from such a decision or other practice.”.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.—The amendments made by section 3 shall apply to claims of discrimination in compensation brought under title I and section 503 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq., 12203), pursuant to section 107(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12117(a)), which adopts the powers, remedies, and procedures set forth in section 706 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–5).

(b) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—The amendments made by section 3 shall apply to claims of discrimination in compensation brought under sections 501 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791, 794), pursuant to—

(1) sections 501(g) and 504(d) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 791(g), 794(d)), respectively, which adopt the standards applied under title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 for determining whether a violation has occurred in a complaint alleging employment discrimination; and

(2) paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 505(a) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 794a(a)) (as amended by subsection (c)).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—Section 505(a) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794a(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting after “(42 U.S.C. 2000e–5 (f) through (k))” the following: “(and the application of section 706(e)(3) (42 U.S.C. 2000e–5(e)(3)) to claims of discrimination in compensation)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “1964” the following: “(42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) (and in subsection (e)(3) of section 706 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–5), applied to claims of discrimination in compensation)”.

(2) CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—Section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) Section 706(e)(3) shall apply to complaints of discrimination in compensation under this section.”.

(3) AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.—Section 15(f) of the Age Discrimina-

tion in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 633a(f)) is amended by striking “of section” and inserting “of sections 7(d)(3) and”.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, take effect as if enacted on May 28, 2007 and apply to all claims of discrimination in compensation under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), title I and section 503 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and sections 501 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, that are pending on or after that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 181.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives meets to give final approval to the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and send it to President Obama for his signature. What a difference a new Congress and a President make.

Nondiscrimination in the workplace must be a sacred American principle. Workers should be paid based upon their merits, not an employer's prejudices. Yet, more than 40 years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Supreme Court dramatically turned back the clock on this bedrock principle. Instead of abiding by decades of long-standing law, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court decided to commit legal jujitsu to satisfy a narrow ideological agenda. The Supreme Court simply told bad employers that to escape responsibility for pay discrimination all they need to do is keep it hidden for the first 180 days.

The Ledbetter ruling has already dramatically impacted how Americans can remedy discrimination. It has been cited in hundreds of cases over the past 19 months since the ruling. Not only have pay discrimination cases been adversely impacted, but even fair housing protections and title IX complaints. The Supreme Court sent these lower courts backwards down the wrong path, and today the Congress will correct that course by passing this bill.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act would simply reset the law as businesses, most courts, employers and employees and the EEOC had understood it before the Court's 2007 ruling. Under S. 181, every paycheck or other compensation resulting, in whole or part, from an earlier discriminatory pay de-

cision or other practice would constitute a violation of title VII. In other words, if an employer keeps issuing discriminatory paychecks, that employer will keep restarting the clock for filing charges. That's only fair. As long as workers file their charges, as Lilly Ledbetter herself did, within 180 days of a discriminatory paycheck, the charges will be considered timely. The legislation also clarifies that an employee is entitled to up to 2 years back-pay as provided in title VII already.

Finally, S. 181 ensures that these simple reforms extend to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act to provide these same protections for victims of age and disability discrimination.

Correcting pay discrimination poses significant challenges to workers, made all the harder with the Supreme Court's Ledbetter decision. This is best illustrated by Lilly Ledbetter's own words from an Education and Labor Committee hearing in 2007: “What happened to me is not only an insult to my dignity, but it had real consequences for my ability to care for my family. Every paycheck I received, I got less than what I was entitled to under the law.

“The Supreme Court said that this didn't count as illegal discrimination, but it sure feels like discrimination when you are on the receiving end of that smaller paycheck and trying to support your family with less money than the men are getting for doing the same job. And according to the Court, if you don't figure things out right away, the company can treat you like a second-class citizen for the rest of your career. This isn't right.”

I agree with Lilly Ledbetter: what happened to her wasn't right.

Unfortunately, it's too late for Lilly Ledbetter to receive justice. But today, thanks to Lilly's incredible courage and perseverance, and thanks to millions of Americans making their voices heard, Congress will reject this ruling for the millions of Americans suddenly now subject to legal discrimination.

The Ledbetter v. Goodyear Supreme Court ruling was a painful step backwards for civil rights in this country. Today, the House will correct this injustice and send President Obama his first bill to sign into law. All victims of discrimination are entitled to justice, and I urge my colleagues to support the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us was the first substantive piece of legislation considered by the 111th Congress. In a matter of days, it could be one of the first substantive measures signed into law by the 44th President of the United States. And despite all the promises of openness and bipartisanship, at the end of the day it will have been considered not once, not twice,

but three separate times in the House without the opportunity to debate a single Republican amendment. It didn't have to be this way.

This legislation is supposed to be about protecting workers—and especially women—from discrimination in the workplace. Like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am strongly opposed to discrimination of any type, be it gender discrimination, racial discrimination, or any other type of discrimination inside or outside the workplace. Rooting out such discrimination is a bipartisan goal, and I cannot think of a single reason why it is not being given a bipartisan debate.

The arguments on both sides of this bill are clear, and they have been debated on this floor before. For my part, I believe that enriching trial lawyers is simply the wrong way to ensure a fairer, more just workplace; and clearly that's what this bill will do. By eliminating the statute of limitations, the bill invites more and costlier lawsuits. We're talking about economic stimulus this week, so it's only fitting that we begin with an economic stimulus package for trial lawyers.

But for me, Mr. Speaker, the controversy we face today is not just the underlying legislation, although it certainly is controversial. No, the controversy today is the stunning lack of openness being shown by a majority that seems intent on wielding the heavy hand of power.

Less than 24 hours ago, the Rules Committee held an emergency meeting in order to bring this bill to the floor today. As I understand it, the job of the Rules Committee is to consider potential amendments and decide which of those will receive a vote by the full House. After 2 years of watching Republican amendments routinely discarded without a vote, I wasn't surprised that the majority brought this bill to the floor under a closed rule. What surprised me was that they didn't even bother to keep up the illusion that they might make one of our proposals in order. In fact, the Rules Committee did not even set a deadline for amendments on this bill, so certain were they that not a single proposal would be worthy of consideration.

For the record, I offered two amendments that were refused by the majority, two amendments that I believe were consistent with the majority's stated goals of preventing wage discrimination and overturning the Ledbetter decision. At the same time, I believe those amendments would have helped to avert at least some of the unintended consequences this legislation is sure to spawn. I did not ask the majority to guarantee that my amendments would pass; I simply asked for a debate among the Members of good will who can argue the merits and vote as they see fit. I was denied.

Mr. Speaker, workplace discrimination is a serious issue and it deserves a serious debate. What a disappointment this is.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend for yielding.

Lilly Ledbetter went to work in a factory in Alabama. She was one of the best at her job as a supervisor. She routinely won awards for being best at what she did. Late in her career, when she retired, she found out that she was systemically paid about 30 percent less than the men next to whom she worked. She filed suit in Federal court. The company said she wasn't underpaid because she was a woman, she was underpaid for other reasons. A jury of her peers heard her case and the employer's case, and she won unanimously.

The case went up through the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court, in the case that now bears her name, unfortunately, said that because she didn't file suit when she didn't know that she had been discriminated against, she couldn't recover. So because the employer was successful at hiding the discrimination for a period of time, she couldn't recover.

Lilly Ledbetter could be any one of our mothers, daughters, sisters, wives, or neighbors. What was done to her is an affront not only to her, but to the law. Women should not confront this law as a trap to deny them their rights. The law should not be a vessel of injustice. And we should not wait to pass this bill, put it on President Obama's desk, and make it the law of the land today.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield at this time to the gentleman from Minnesota, the ranking member of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction, such time as he may consume, Mr. KLINE.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose, yet again, seriously flawed legislation. As you know, we passed this bill just 2 weeks ago, and it is before us once again.

Unfortunately, the flaws and the potential damage to our civil rights and our economy remain. The enthusiastic supporters of the Ledbetter Act continue to beat the drum, claiming we are simply voting on a straightforward bill to reverse a Supreme Court decision involving discrimination in the workplace. Despite the passage of time and continued requests by my colleagues and I in the minority party, however, they are no closer to telling the whole story.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us would reverse a court decision for the benefit of Lilly Ledbetter, but perhaps more significantly, it would dismantle the long-standing statute of limitations es-

tablished by the 1964 Civil Rights Act. And this is the reason that the Supreme Court ruled the way they did. They held that the statute of limitations is an important part of our society, of our government, of our way of doing business in this country, and we need to preserve that statute of limitations.

While I can understand the pain that Ms. Ledbetter felt, can you imagine as an employer trying to keep track of decisions going back 20 years and more and trying to defend those in a court? It is not practical, it's not fair.

This bill would set into motion unintended consequences that its supporters simply are not willing to acknowledge, including radically increasing the opportunity for frivolous and abusive litigation. This is, indeed, another boon for trial lawyers.

Further, this bill would also permit individuals to seek damages against employers for whom they never worked by allowing family members and others who were never directly subjected to discrimination to become plaintiffs even after the worker in question is deceased.

Just this weekend our new President said our economic troubles are worsening. We should heed his caution and recognize that in such a climate we cannot afford to enable endless litigation and potentially staggering record-keeping requirements on employers. We are trying to get employers to create more jobs to hire more people.

We must also be wary of the devastating effect this bill could have on pensions by exposing employers to decades-old discrimination claims that they have little—or I would argue no—ability to defend. This legislation could risk the retirement security of many hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it's very clear that this legislation amounts to a significant change in our civil rights laws. And despite a delay, we have had no more debate or deliberation, leaving unanswered many relevant questions that deserve to be addressed through the normal legislative process.

My concerns and unanswered questions can only lead me to say that the Ledbetter bill makes for bad policy created through a poor legislative process.

I urge my colleagues again to vote "no."

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield myself 15 seconds just to say, according to the analysis done by the Congressional Budget Office, there is no new cost associated with this legislation because it creates no new cause of action, and no anticipated increase in litigation in spite of the remarks of the gentleman from the other side of the aisle. And that's what the independent analysis shows of this legislation.

I would like now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the subcommittee Chair of the committee of jurisdiction.

□ 1515

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I don't know about the rest of you, but I've come to think of Lilly Ledbetter as my girlfriend. I mean she has been so important to all of us and to women and to the issue on this landmark day that we have today for women and American workers and their families because this bill does tell the whole story. And at the end of this debate, we will be one step closer to overturning an unjust Supreme Court decision, a decision that offered a restricted and decidedly unrealistic reading of when a discriminatory action regarding compensation actually occurs.

Good for the Senate for joining us in passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and with an overwhelming bipartisan vote at that, giving us the go-ahead to do exactly the right thing.

Sadly, Lilly Ledbetter will not be affected by our actions, but we know that she has paved the way for others who will benefit from her bravery and will have recourse when they are paid less than their male counterparts.

The President understands that equality and fairness are crucial in a free society. He understands that more than 40 years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act, women are still paid an average of just 78 cents for every dollar a man earns.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill, and I look forward to President Obama's signing it into action, into law, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time to the gentleman from California, a new member of the committee, Mr. McCLINTOCK, such time as he may consume.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the chilling effect this legislation will have on our economy because of the endless lawsuits it makes possible, including for grievances that may stretch back 30 years or more, and I certainly share those concerns.

But I want to express a deeper concern with this legislation. I believe it hurts the cause of equality and opportunity in the workplace by making it more difficult for the people who need jobs and who most want those jobs to actually get them.

Any person's labor is worth exactly what that person's willing to receive and what another is willing to pay. The decisions that are made by both the employee and the employer are unique to those people and to those circumstances. Someone passionately wanting to break into a field, for example, or to stay in a region or to shorten a commute or an infinite variety of other considerations may be willing to accept less in order to gain those non-economic advantages than someone who is equally qualified but indifferent to those advantages. Imposing rigid one-size-fits-all requirements into the relationship between an employee and an employer reduces the employee's

freedom to negotiate for the best set of overall conditions for his or her own unique circumstances. And lest we forget, when all else fails, there is a fail-safe and absolute protection: It's the word "no." No, the pay is not acceptable; no, the conditions are not satisfactory; no, I can get a better job elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works, and it's time that we put it back to work.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE), a member of the committee.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise once again in strong support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, and I commend the Senate for passing the legislation so quickly and commend the leadership of this House, Chairman MILLER, for bringing it to the floor for its final vote.

It's remarkable that the potential first piece of legislation signed into law by President Obama this year is one that will help victims of pay discrimination.

Last year I had the privilege of hearing Mrs. Ledbetter testify before the Education and Labor Committee. After 19 years, 19 years as a Goodyear employee, Mrs. Ledbetter discovered she was paid significantly less than every single one of her male counterparts. She took her case all the way to the Supreme Court where it was thrown out on a technicality. She filed her paperwork too late. Unfortunately, Mrs. Ledbetter had no idea this was even happening to her. I suppose the Supreme Court decided that Mrs. Ledbetter was a mind reader.

This Fair Pay Act would correct this wrong by clarifying that every paycheck resulting from a discriminatory pay decision constitutes a violation of the Civil Rights Act and employees have 180 days after each discriminatory paycheck to file a suit.

Again, I am pleased Congress is acting swiftly to correct a disastrous Supreme Court ruling that allows bad employers to discriminate against their employees as long as they hide it for 180 days. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for S. 181 so we can promptly send it to the President's desk.

Thank you, Lilly Ledbetter.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a champion of fair pay and equal pay for women.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. I congratulate Chairman MILLER, the driving force behind this effort, who, with great tenacity and great leadership, has given this issue the priority that it deserves.

Together, with his colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee and our dedicated partners in the Senate, Chairman MILLER has brought gender-

based pay discrimination front and center in this Congress, and as a result, we finally have the opportunity to send powerful legislation to the President's desk today.

We are here because Lilly Ledbetter got shortchanged, shortchanged by her employer, the perpetrator of consistent pay discrimination lasting years; and shortchanged again by the Supreme Court.

A jury found that, yes, Lilly Ledbetter had been discriminated against by her employer. They awarded her \$3.8 million in back pay and damages. But then under Title VII, this award was reduced to \$360,000, and ultimately zero when the Supreme Court ruled 5-4 against her in 2007, drastically limiting women's access to seek justice for pay discrimination based on gender, requiring workers to file a pay discrimination claim within a 6-month period only, regardless of how long the pay inequity goes on. When women still earn only about 78 percent of what men earn, this ruling has essentially rolled back efforts to ensure equal pay and left women with little remedy.

As Justice Ginsburg suggested in her dissent, Congress has an obligation to correct the court's decision. That is why we must pass the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, clearly stating that Title VII statute of limitations runs from the date a discriminatory wage is actually paid, not simply some earliest possible date which has come and gone long ago. Instead, you would be able to challenge discriminatory paychecks as long as you continue to receive them.

But we cannot stop there. I strongly urge the Senate to build on this vital foundation. Take up the Paycheck Fairness Act, which this House passed in tandem with the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, to face gender discrimination head on and eliminate the systemic discrimination faced by women.

Mr. Speaker, that process starts in earnest. With the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, we can begin to ensure pay equity. We can help families gain the resources they need to give their children a better future, the great promise of our American Dream. Let us make good on that promise, pass this bill. Let us make sure that women who face the discrimination that Lilly Ledbetter faced have the right and the tools to fight against it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I congratulate the Democratic leadership on moving this bill forward, George, Rosa, Lynn, so many who worked so hard on it.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act stands for equal pay for equal work. This bill overrules the outrageous Supreme Court decision which rejected Ms. Ledbetter's pay discrimination

case because she had not sued quickly enough to end an injustice. An injustice is an injustice, and it should not have a time limit on correcting it.

Forty years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act and title VI, statistics show that women continue to be paid less than their male colleagues. When I entered the workforce, women were paid 59 cents to every dollar a man earned. Today it's up to 78 cents. A disparity which costs women anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million in lost wages over a lifetime. This is terribly unfair.

In the midst of the dire economic reports of these last weeks and months, today this Congress can take a step towards helping women and families who are struggling by passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. There are too many Lilly Ledbetters in our country, and when you discriminate against a woman, you discriminate against her family, her husband, her children. Passing the Fair Pay Act sends a strong message of fairness and equity to women and families everywhere.

This may be the first bill that gets to President Obama's desk. It shows a change and a shift of priorities between a Democratic Congress and the one we replaced. I congratulate all my colleagues and the Democratic leadership for moving it forward.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Kudos to Mr. MILLER, who would not give up on this bill, for his early hearings and this early consideration now, and to the Speaker and to our leadership for this early floor time just when women need us most when the economy is indeed punishing them enough.

I hold here a settlement agreement that is perhaps the best evidence of why we need this bill. The first case brought under the so-called Congressional Accountability Act, that was the act of about 10 or 15 years ago that said that the Congress had to abide by the same rules and rights as workers have in the private sector. This suit was brought by 300 current and former female custodians. All of them were African American women. They accused the House of Representatives and the Senate of paying them \$1 less than men who had comparable jobs. After a long period of depositions and discovery, where a class was approved, the Congress paid \$2.5 million to these women.

Like Lilly Ledbetter, most of them had worked for many years as female custodians in the House and the Senate. Like Lilly Ledbetter, they had no idea they were being paid less than the men who did the same jobs, collecting our trash, if you will, in our offices. The way they found out and the only way they found out is that they were represented by a great union, the American Federation of Government Employees, who represented them in court and got the settlement. I remem-

ber going over to the Ford building and helping to hand out the checks. Many of the women, like Lilly Ledbetter, were near retirement. And this settlement agreement shows that those women, unlike Lilly Ledbetter, indeed received funds from the United States Congress under the Equal Pay Act. That is how the act was enforced when I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. That is how it was enforced before I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. And that is how we return it today.

I would like to include this settlement agreement in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PATRICIA HARRIS, et al., Plaintiffs, v.
OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, Defendant.

C.A. No. 97-1658 (EGS), Filed July 25, 2001,
Nancy Mayer Whittington, Clerk, U.S. District Court.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement is entered into this 20th day of July 2001, between plaintiffs Patricia Harris, et al. as class representatives, (hereinafter collectively referred to as "plaintiffs"), on the one hand, and defendant the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (hereinafter referred to as the "Architect"), on the other hand, for the purpose of finally resolving all aspects of this class action. In the interest of avoiding the expense, delay, and inconvenience of further litigation of the issues raised in this action, and in consideration of the mutual promises, covenants, and obligations in this Agreement, and for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and adequacy of which are acknowledged, plaintiffs and defendant, through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate and agree as follows, subject to the approval of the Court.

I. DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. "Agreement" and "Settlement Agreement"—These terms refer to this Settlement Agreement and all attachments thereto.

B. "Effective date of this Agreement"—This term refers to the date of Final Court Approval of this Agreement.

C. "Final Court Approval"—This term refers to the latest of the following dates, after the conduct of a Fairness Hearing and approval of this Agreement by the Court: the date on which any and all appeals from any objections to the Agreement have been dismissed, a final appellate decision upholding approval has been rendered, or the time for taking an appeal has expired without an appeal having been taken. If there are no objections to the Agreement, this term refers to that date, following the conduct of the Fairness Hearing, on which the Court grants final approval of the Agreement.

D. "Preliminary Court approval"—This term refers to that date, following submission of this Agreement to the Court by the parties but prior to the conduct of a Fairness Hearing, on which the Court grants initial approval of the Agreement.

E. The "parties' execution of this Settlement Agreement"—This term refers to the date on which all parties have signed the Agreement.

F. "Plaintiffs", "plaintiff class" or "class members"—These terms refer to the class of plaintiffs certified by the District Court on February 29, 2000:

"All women custodial workers employed by the Architect of the Capitol on or after January 23, 1996, the effective date of the Congressional Accountability Act, including those who terminated their employment or

retired after that date and who were hired after that date, with respect to the causes of action alleged herein as violative of Section 201(a) and (b) of the Congressional Accountability Act, 2 U.S.C. §1311(a) & (b), which incorporate the rights and remedies of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2 and other sections cited therein, and make them applicable to the defendant and the legislative branch generally."

G. "Plaintiffs' counsel" and "counsel for plaintiffs"—These terms refer to plaintiffs' class counsel, Beins, Axelrod & Kraft, P.C. "Counsel for the parties" refers to counsel for the plaintiff class and counsel for the defendant.

H. "Active Class Members" are the class members who are currently employed with the Architect as of the date of the parties' execution of this Settlement Agreement who elect not to retire.

I. "Inactive Class Members" are those class members who, as of the date of the parties' execution of this Agreement, have been terminated or retired, died, resigned or been promoted out of the class. The retired class members who are part of the Inactive Class Members are those class members who retired before April 9, 2001.

J. "Retirement Eligible Class Members" are those class members who had not retired as of April 9, 2001, but who 1) are retirement eligible (by qualifying age and years of service), and 2) elect to retire pursuant to the terms of Section II (B) of this Agreement.

K. The term "night custodial workers" refers to female employees who work during the night shift.

L. The term "day custodial workers" refers to female employees who work during the day shift.

M. The Office of Personnel Management will be hereinafter referred to as "OPM."

N. The Congressional Accountability Act will be hereinafter referred to as the "CAA."

II. MONETARY RELIEF

A. Active Class Members and Inactive Class Members

1. Pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, a lump sum payment from the Department of Treasury will be made to plaintiffs' counsel (to be calculated as set forth in paragraph two below) to distribute to the Active Class Members and the Inactive Class Members at plaintiffs' counsel's discretion, except that those Inactive Class members who were terminated for cause will not receive a payment for any time period beyond the date they were terminated.

2. The lump sum payment for distribution by plaintiffs' counsel to the Active Class Members and Inactive Class Members will be based on the sum of two calculations: 1) the number of Active Class Members multiplied by \$7,000 and 2) the number of Inactive Class Members multiplied by \$4,000. The lump sum payment for distribution to the Active Class Members will be reduced by \$7,000 for each Active Class Member who is retirement eligible and elects to retire. Any money paid under this subparagraph that has not been distributed to class members two years after Final Court Approval of the settlement will be remitted back to the Office of Compliance to be returned to the Department of Treasury.

B. Retirement Eligible Class Members

1. Pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, an individual lump payment from the Department of Treasury will be made in the amount of \$20,000 to each of the Retirement Eligible Class Members.

2. Only those class members who: a) are eligible to retire as of April 9, 2001 or become eligible to retire during the period of April 9, 2001 through September 30, 2001, and b) who

actually retire during the period of April 9, 2001, through September 30, 2001, may retire during this period and receive the individual lump sum payment described in paragraph B.1 above. All class members who are eligible to retire during this period will have 60 days after receiving the class notice (as described more fully below) to designate whether they will retire. A class member's decision under this paragraph is irrevocable unless the Court disapproves this Agreement.

3. In order to be eligible for the individual lump sum payment described in paragraph B.1 above, each class member who chooses to retire before Final Court Approval of the Settlement and actually begins her retirement before Final Court Approval must agree in writing, and will acknowledge in writing, as follows:

"If the Court does not finally approve the Settlement Agreement, I will not receive the \$20,000 individual lump sum payment or have any further recourse against the Architect, except to continue as a plaintiff in *Harris v. Office of the Architect of the Capitol*, Civil Action No. 97-16587

C. Payment Terms

1. Pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, payments under Sections II and III of this Settlement Agreement shall be made from the Department of Treasury. Payments shall be made to class members whom the parties have identified and who have exhausted the counseling and mediation procedures of the CAA. Class members identified after the execution of this Agreement will be required to exhaust the counseling and mediation procedures of the CAA in order to be eligible for the relief described in Sections II and III of this Settlement Agreement.

2. Plaintiffs' counsel and the Retirement Eligible Class Members shall receive the payments as set forth in sections A and B above within sixty (60) days after Final Court Approval of the Settlement.

3. Nothing in this Agreement shall increase or decrease the amount of taxes owed by the plaintiffs under the tax code and other applicable provisions of law.

D. Attorneys' Fees and Costs

1. Pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, a payment of \$290,000 from the Department of Treasury shall be made to plaintiffs' counsel, which represent plaintiffs' counsels' costs and fees at the applicable *Laffey* rates as of August 31, 2000. This payment will be made within a reasonable time period. Defendant agrees to assist in expediting this payment by taking whatever steps are reasonably possible in accordance with established procedures of the United States Attorney's Office. In addition, pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA a one-time lump sum payment from the Department of Treasury shall be made to plaintiffs' counsel for reasonable fees and costs after August 31, 2000 at the applicable *Laffey* rates, based on monthly invoices to be submitted to and approved by Defendant's counsel. Plaintiffs' counsel will submit an invoice for each month in which services are performed after August 31, 2000 following the parties' execution of this Agreement.

2. Pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, a payment from the Department of Treasury in the amount of \$5,235.00 to plaintiffs' counsel for plaintiffs' expert fees.

3. Defendant shall pay the mediator in this matter, Linda Singer, the sum of \$9,484.22, which is the amount owed for her services as of November 15, 2000. Defendant agrees to pay Ms. Singer's additional fees if the parties require her services after November 15, 2000, not to exceed \$16,000. To the extent plaintiffs have paid any mediation fees to Ms. Singer, defendant will reimburse plaintiffs for those fees in lieu of Ms. Singer.

III. NON-MONETARY RELIEF

A. Prospective Promotions With Pay for Active Class Members

Within sixty days after Final Court Approval of this Agreement, all Active Class Members will receive a promotion. The promotion will be retroactive to the date of Final Court Approval of the Settlement. All Active Class Members who are night custodial workers will be upgraded from a WG-2 to a WG-3 and will be paid at the WG-3 level at their current step. All Active Class Members who are day custodial workers will be upgraded from a WG-2 or WG-3 to a WG-4 and will be paid at the WG-4 level at their current step. No Retirement Eligible Class Member will receive the promotion referred to in this paragraph A. All Active Class Members who are night custodial workers will retain their night differential.

B. Retroactive Promotions

Within six months of the date of Final Court Approval, the Architect will retroactively promote all class members as of January 23, 1996, the effective date of the CAA. All night custodial workers will be retroactively promoted to a WG-3 at the step they would have held if they had been a WG-3 on January 23, 1996. All day custodial workers will be retroactively promoted to a WG-4 at the step they would have held if they had been a WG-4 on January 23, 1996. No class member will receive back pay as a result of this retroactive promotion. To effectuate this provision of the Agreement, pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, a payment from the Department of Treasury shall be made in an amount sufficient to make all appropriate payments to the Office of Personnel Management for the retirement fund under Chapter 83 or 84 of Title 5 U.S. Code, which includes payments for each class member and the AOC and appropriate deductions for any additional coverage for the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance Program ("FEGLI").

The National Finance Center ("NFC") will calculate the additional amount of employee retirement withholding and employer contribution due for each pay period of the retroactive promotion for each class member. This additional amount will be based on the difference in the base pay of the class members' old and new grade levels, multiplied by the applicable statutory percentages for the employee deduction and the agency contribution to the retirement fund. The NFC will also calculate for each class member, if applicable, the amount of any additional deductions for the MU. Additionally, pursuant to Section 415 of the CAA, a payment shall be made from the Department of Treasury in an amount sufficient to pay an invoice submitted to the AOC by the NFC for the cost of performing the referenced calculations under this section, including overtime charges and indirect costs.

C. Notice of Vacant Positions

Beginning sixty days after Final Court Approval of this Agreement, the Architect will send all vacancy announcements for Wage Grade and GS positions for which plaintiffs may be eligible (including but not limited to Wage Grade and GS 3, 4, 5 and 6 positions) to the plaintiffs' counsel on a monthly basis for one year.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR CLASS NOTICE

A. Notice to Potential Class Members

Within 60 days after Preliminary Court Approval of this Agreement, the Architect shall send a Notice to potential class members at their last known address. Attachment A hereto is a proposed "Notice of Proposed Settlement and of Hearing on Proposed Settlement" ("Fairness Notice"), which the par-

ties hereby request that the Court approve in connection with scheduling the Fairness Hearing, as set forth in paragraph VI below. This notice to class members shall also include this Agreement. The Architect shall pay for the cost of this mailing.

B. Published Notice

In order to advise all potential class members of their rights under this Agreement, including class members who have retired, who have relocated, or whose current location is unknown, the Architect shall arrange for the publication, at the Architect's expense, of a one-time Notice in the general news sections of the District of Columbia Metro and Prince George's County editions of *The Washington Post*, and in *Roll Call*. The text of the published notice will be submitted to plaintiffs' counsel for their review and approval in advance of publications.

V. PROCEDURES FOR FAIRNESS HEARING

A. Hearing No Later Than 60 Days After Preliminary Approval

The parties request that the Court schedule a Fairness Hearing to be held no later than 60 days after the Court preliminarily approves the settlement.

B. Objections to Settlement Agreement

Any person who wishes to object to the terms of this Agreement, must submit, not less than 15 days prior to the Fairness Hearing, a written statement to the Court, with copies to counsel for the parties. The statement shall contain the individual's name, address and telephone number, along with a statement of her objection(s) to the Agreement and the reason(s) for the objection(s).

C. Parties to Use Best Efforts to Obtain Prompt Judicial Approval

The parties and their counsel shall jointly use their best efforts to obtain prompt judicial approval of this Agreement. The parties have bargained in good faith for the terms of this Agreement. No section or subsection of this Settlement may be modified or stricken without consent of the parties, and in no event after Final Court Approval. If the Court does not approve of this Settlement as written, the Agreement shall be voidable in its entirety at the option of either party.

VI. OTHER MATTERS

A. The plaintiffs relinquish all rights to reopen this action or to seek further or relief than is provided in this Agreement.

B. The parties to this action have entered into this Agreement to resolve all issues in controversy in this action. In recognition of this fact, neither the terms of this Agreement nor their substance may be offered, taken, construed, or introduced as evidence of liability or as an admission or statement of wrongdoing by the defendant, or used for any other reason either in this action or in any subsequent proceeding of any nature.

C. This Agreement shall not constitute an admission of liability or fault on the part of the Office of the Architect, its agents, servants, or employees, and is entered into by all parties for the sole purpose of compromising disputed claims and avoiding the expenses and risks of further litigation.

D. This Agreement comprises the full and exclusive agreement of the parties with respect to the matters discussed herein. No representations or inducements to compromise this action or the administrative proceedings that gave rise to it have been made, other than those recited in this Agreement. No statements other than those recited in this Agreement are binding upon the parties with respect to the disposition of this action or the administrative proceedings that gave rise to it.

E. The terms of this Agreement shall constitute full and complete satisfaction of all

claims of class members against the defendant that arise out of events occurring up to Final Court Approval of this Agreement which fall within the scope of the allegations in the fourth amended complaint in this action, and of all rights of the class members to relief within the scope of this action. Upon Final Court Approval of this Agreement, the class as a whole and each class member individually shall be bound by the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel with respect to all such claims.

F. This Agreement shall be enforceable in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

G. This action will be dismissed with prejudice upon Final Court Approval.

Counsel for Plaintiffs: Barbara Kraft and Sarah J. Starrett.

Counsel for Defendant: Kenneth L. Wainstein, U.S. Attorney; Mark E. Nagle, Assistant U.S. Attorney; Stacy M. Ludwig, Assistant U.S. Attorney.

This Agreement has been approved by the Office of Compliance pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §1414.

WILLIAM W. THOMPSON, II,

Executive Director, Office of Compliance.

Approved and So Ordered on this 20th day of July, 2001.

HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN,

United States District Judge.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT A FAIRNESS HEARING IS SCHEDULED FOR September 28, 2001, at 11 a.m. in Courtroom #1.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this act. I join with so many of my colleagues who find it extraordinarily important that we right the wrong of the Supreme Court decision and allow access to the courts for those who have been discriminated against in terms of pay equity.

And Lilly Ledbetter and the act that is before us today, I want to thank Chairman GEORGE MILLER for his leadership and his hard work on this and his committee for their relentless pursuit of correcting this. It's one of the very first acts of this new Congress, and I just want to rise in support of it and hope that it gains an extraordinary vote in the House today because it will send a message to not only my mother, my wife, my daughters, but to women throughout our country and to others that the United States Congress stands squarely on the right side of history on this critically important question.

Mr. McKEON. I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader.

□ 1530

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman, I thank the ranking member, I thank the United States Senate for passing this bill.

I am proud that this is the very first bill that we passed in this House in the 111th Congress. Lilly Ledbetter is a woman of courage, leadership, and my daughters owe her a debt of gratitude.

In passing that bill, we recognized that sexism and discrimination can still cheat women out of equal pay and equal worth, a theft of livelihood and dignity that is especially damaging as families across our country struggle to pay their bills, as if somehow a single mom raising children could do it more cheaply than a single dad raising those same children.

That didn't make any sense then or now. Within my lifetime, sexism in the workplace could be blatant and unashamed, but today it does some of its worst work in secret.

We can take a stand against it by voting for final passage today. It was secret sexism that cheated Lilly Ledbetter out of the thousands of dollars for years. And we repeat her story, not because it is unique and shocking, but because it's typical, typical of the experience of so many American women, indeed, women all over the world.

Ms. Ledbetter was a supervisor at a tire plant. For years she was paid less than her male coworkers, but she was paid a differential in secret. Her employer didn't tell her I am going to pay you less than I pay your male counterparts who do exactly the same work. For years, she was left in the dark, and by the time she finally saw the proof, the Supreme Court said it was too late. Ironic.

I will tell you on assault there may be in some States no statute of limitations and others there may be a statute of limitations. Essentially, what happens here, if they keep hitting you, and they keep hitting you month after month after month, it's not the last hit that counted, it's the first hit that counted. And you couldn't sue for that, what we would call, we lawyers, tortious conduct, others would call criminal conduct.

But there was no responsibility that Lilly Ledbetter could get from the employer for wrongdoing, for breaking the law. There was no dispute that the law was broken. It was simply that it was broken in secret. And so Lilly Ledbetter had to suffer in public.

The Supreme Court ruled that even though Ms. Ledbetter had suffered clear discrimination, the law had been broken. She had missed the time in which to raise the issue. How perverse, in a nation of laws, of justice, of equity, that we would say they broke the law in secret, and you didn't know it, and you couldn't find it out and, therefore, we will not redress your recognized grievance.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do, not just for Lilly Ledbetter, not just for women, it's the right thing to do because our country believes in fairness, in equity, that we are a nation of laws and treat people equally under those laws. That is why it's so appropriate for us to pass this bill today and send it to the President, who will sign it proudly. All of us who vote for it and see its enactment will be proud as well.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Our Nation is facing serious challenges. The economic picture remains bleak, with seemingly more jobs lost every day. American families are struggling to pay bills and send their families to college. I don't object to the fact that we are considering this bill again, despite widespread concern about its consequences. What bothers me about it is that we are not truly debating it. Had this bill truly been "a narrow fix," as the supporters would have the American people believe, this rush to approval may not have been such a problem.

However, this is a major, fundamental change to civil rights law affecting no less than four separate statutes. The last change to civil rights law of this magnitude, the 1991 civil rights law, took 2 years of negotiation, debate and partisan accord to accomplish.

Instead, what we have before us is a partisan product that is fundamentally flawed. It guts the statute of limitations contained in current law and, in doing so, would allow an employee to bring a claim against an employer decades after the alleged initial act of discrimination occurred. Trial lawyers, you can be sure, are salivating at this very prospect.

You know, I think about a person that maybe did one of these acts 30 years ago, has since sold the company, the company has since sold again, the original employer that made the discrimination case in the first place has since passed away and now a trial lawyer can bring all of these people to court. The person who passed away maybe would still have that liability. It boggles my mind to think of the unintended consequences that will come from this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill, and it's the result of an equally bad process. It breaks the vows of bipartisanship that the majority has made time and time again. In the last election and in the previous election they talked about bipartisanship. They talked about regular order, they talked about transparency, about working together. You know, we could work out our honest differences but do it in the light of the day before the American people and, once again, we are denied that opportunity. I think the American people deserve better.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act goes to basic and fundamental American values, both in our daily lives and in our workplace, and that is that people ought to be rewarded with equal pay for equal work. It's fundamental, it's

basic to our economy, it's basic to our society. It's basic to our sense of fairness, to our sense of justice, and to our sense of equality.

But in far too many workplaces that's not what is done. Women, in many instances, time and time again, for doing the same job that men are doing in the same manner that men are doing it, are paid less, not because they are not doing the job equally as well as the men, but because somebody decided that they were going to pay them less simply because they were women.

That runs counter to the values of this Nation. It runs counter to the values of our society. It runs counter to the best interests of women. It's rather fascinating that they are suggesting that because of tough economic times some businesses may only be able to survive if they can engage in discrimination. If they can carry out a business plan based upon discrimination, they may be able to survive, so women should underwrite that discriminatory policy and accept less.

Well, let me tell you what it's like when you are trying to support a family, either as a dual wage earner or by yourself, and you are accepting less every week, every day, every hour for the work that you are doing the same as the people alongside of you, but you are getting less because you are a woman. Try that in these tough economic times. Try running your household in these tough economic times where the Republicans would have you believe we should enforce the policy of discrimination, that somehow women should underwrite these difficult times by accepting, being a victim of discrimination.

I don't think so. I don't think the people in this Congress believe that. I don't believe the people in this country believe that, and that's why we're going to pass this legislation.

It's fundamental to the values of this country. Now, they are trying to run up the scare tactics that this gets rid of the statute of limitation, same statute of limitations, 180 days, that somehow if you had waited a long time you would collect more recovery than otherwise. No, you get 2 years of backpay, that's the maximum, and that's it. But they want to suggest otherwise, no, that's what the law says.

And because of that, because we reset the law to what it was, as it was interpreted by courts all over this country and by employers and employees, the CBO in its independent analysis said this does not increase costs because it does not create a new cause of action and they don't expect a lot of litigation as a result of this because we go back to the law as it was.

So let's move along here and get rid of this outrageous discriminatory practice that was sanctified by the Supreme Court in some kind of ideological rampage against women and the treatment and the fairness of them in the workplace.

We have an opportunity to do that now. We will pass this bill today, we

will send it to the White House where our new President, Barack Obama, has said he will sign this legislation. And with that signature on this bill, we can change the law in this country to once again make sure that women are provided equal pay for equal work that they do in the American workplace, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for this very important bill. I thank Speaker PELOSI for championing this effort to improve the lives of American women and their families.

The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act is a bill of enormous importance for women's rights and civil rights in general. For decades, companies big and small have paid women less for the same work as their male counterparts. Today, we correct a major fault in both law and market, and we move toward true equality for all men and women in America.

This bill is important in so many ways. Perhaps most obviously, the bill confirms America's commitment to women's rights. Kofi Annan, the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, was right on the mark when he said, "when women thrive, all of society benefits, and succeeding generations are given a better start in life." Today we help underpaid women thrive, we help restore a sense of dignity and pride, we help women—mothers and mentors, daughters and sisters—improve the lives of others as we lawfully improve theirs.

With the passage of this bill, we tell working American women that their work is valued, that it is just as good as a man's, and that they deserve fair and equal pay. The extra 20 or 30 cents per dollar that so many women do not receive means less food on the table or less money to save for her family's future. Over a lifetime, unequal pay cheats dedicated, hard working women of \$400,000 to \$2 million. Imagine what these women could have done with this money. And to reflect back on the words of Mr. Annan, passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act into law will benefit both current and future generations.

This bill is valuable not only because of its significant place in the women's rights movement, but also because it demonstrates the Congress' and President Obama's commitment to positive change, change that betters the lives of all Americans regardless of gender or race. Our passage of this bill confirms that equality is a priority for this new Congress. The first bill signed into law during the 111th Congress will be the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, ensuring all Americans that—even in these difficult times—their Government is committed to the ultimate American promise of equality for all.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Congressman GEORGE MILLER for his leadership in bringing this legislation forth and for working together to see that gender equity is not just something we talk about, but something that is achieved.

Sadly, women in the United States still earn only 78 cents on the dollar compared to men more than 45 years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act in 1963.

Lilly Ledbetter helped shine new light on this issue when the Supreme Court denied her the \$223,776 in additional wages she would have earned had she been a man in its 2007 deci-

sion, *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.* The Supreme Court was restricted by laws that saw women as less than equal. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act would correct this decision and ensure that future victims of pay discrimination can bring a lawsuit after any act of discriminatory pay.

Women have made enormous advances toward economic equality, but gaps in income between men and women persist and only multiply over time, as the following numbers from Jessica Arons' Center for American Progress Action Fund report, "Lifetime Losses: The Career Wage Gap" show. Passing this bill along with H.R. 12, the Paycheck Fairness Act, would be an important first step in addressing this problem.

Although we encourage our daughters to stay in school and obtain their degrees, women with higher education are losing more income due to the career wage gap. In fact, \$434,000 is the median amount that a full-time female worker loses in wages over a 40-year period as a direct result of the gender pay gap, also known as the "career wage gap."

The wage gap widens as women get older and carries into retirement because women workers earn less than men at every stage of life, and this continues into retirement. Just some of the statistics that demonstrate that inequity exists are:

78 cents: The amount that the average, full-time working woman makes for every \$1 a man makes over a year.

\$713,000: The career wage gap for women with a bachelor's degree or higher.

\$452,000: The career wage gap for women with some college education.

\$392,000: The career wage gap for women with a high school education.

\$270,000: The career wage gap for women with less than a high school education.

17 percent: The additional amount that single mothers would take home in income if they were paid fairly. This would lead to a 50 percent reduction in poverty for these women, from 25.3 percent to 12.6 percent.

13.4 percent: The additional amount that single women would receive in income if they were paid fairly. This would lead to an 84 percent reduction in poverty for these women, from 6.3 percent to 1 percent.

6 percent: The additional amount that married women would earn if they were paid fairly. This would lead to a 62 percent reduction in poverty for these women, from 2.1 percent to 0.8 percent.

\$8,000: The gap between the average retirement income that men and women receive annually. Two-thirds of this disparity can be attributed to the pay gap and occupational segregation.

Higher wages for women would bring greater prosperity to families. A report from the AFL-CIO and the Institute for Women's Policy Research found that if women were paid fairly, family incomes would rise and poverty levels would fall.

This legislation is intended to combat the wage gap that still exists today between men and women in the workplace. It is an important step in addressing the persistent wage gap between women and men.

Early last year the House passed H.R. 2831, legislation reversing last year's Supreme Court decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.*, in which the court ruled, 5-4, that workers filing suit for pay discrimination

must do so within 180 days of the actual decision to discriminate against them.

Which is why we need to pass not only the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act but the Paycheck Protection Act as well to stop discriminatory pay practices by employers against our mothers, wives, daughters, and granddaughters that do the same job as their male counterparts.

As a Member of the Women's Caucus I have been fighting to close the wage gap for American women since before I arrived here as a Representative in 1995, and I believe that equal pay for equal work is a simple matter of justice. Wage disparities are not simply a result of women's education levels or life choices.

In fact, the pay gap between college educated men and women appears the first job after college—even when women are working full-time in the same fields with the same major as men—and continues to widen during the first 10 years in the workforce. Further, this persistent wage gap not only impacts the economic security of women and their families today, it also directly affects women's retirement security tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues, both men and women to support equality in rights and pay for all Americans by supporting H.R. 181, The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, to express my strong support for the bill. I am pleased we are taking up this bill as passed by the senate so we can finally send it to the President's desk after previously passing it twice in this chamber.

The Ledbetter Fair Pay Act corrects and clarifies a serious misinterpretation by the Supreme Court in its 2007 ruling in the case of *Ledbetter v. Goodyear*. In that 5–4 decision, the majority ruled that Lilly Ledbetter, the lone female supervisor at a tire plant in Gadsden, AL, did not file her lawsuit against Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. in the timely manner specified by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The court determined a victim of pay discrimination must file a charge within 180 days of the employer's decision to pay someone less for an unlawfully discriminatory reason such as race, age, sex, or religion.

The Ledbetter Fair Pay Act clarifies that each paycheck resulting from a discriminatory pay decision constitutes a new violation of the employment nondiscrimination law, as long as the charge is filed within 180 days of the employee receiving the paycheck.

The Ledbetter Fair Pay Act restores workers' ability to pursue claims of pay discrimination on not only sex, but race, religion, age, or for any other reason. Congress must pass this legislation to help ensure all workers are treated fairly in the workplace and the standard of equal pay for equal work is upheld. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to end pay discrimination.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009.

The Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 is necessary to overturn the Supreme Court's 2007 decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear*. In that decision, this Supreme Court once again went out of its way to read our anti-discrimination laws as narrowly as possible, and refused to interpret the law as intended by Congress. In

doing so, the Court said something astonishing: the only discriminatory act was the initial decision to pay Lilly Ledbetter less than her male coworkers. Once the employer had successfully concealed that fact from her for 180 days, she was out of luck, and Goodyear could go on paying her less—just because she is a woman—forever. The 180-day deadline to sue had passed. The decision to discriminate was illegal, but paying her less than her male colleagues from that moment forward was not.

This is astonishing because it rewards employers who successfully conceal pay discrimination and makes it virtually impossible for employees to challenge such discrimination. It is also astonishing because—17 years ago when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1991—Congress rejected the reasoning that the Supreme Court relied upon in its *Ledbetter* decision. Through the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Congress rejected the Supreme Court's conclusion that a statute of limitations begins to run when an employer adopts a discriminatory seniority system and does not restart when the discriminatory effects of that system are felt. Congress made clear that it was rejecting this reasoning in the context of discriminatory seniority systems, which was the question presented by the *Lorance* case, and in all other contexts as well.

Until its *Ledbetter* decision, the Supreme Court seemed to have gotten Congress's message. In *Ledbetter*, however, the Supreme Court relied upon the faulty reasoning in *Lorance* and ruled, once again, that a statute of limitations runs only from the time that a discriminatory decision is made. Now we're called upon to do it over again. Hopefully, the Supreme Court will hear us once and for all and interpret statute of limitation periods as we intend. Thus, while *Ledbetter* addresses discrimination in employment, our passage of this bill expresses broad disapproval of the Court's reasoning in any context where it might be applied. Within the specific context of pay discrimination, our use of the phrase "discriminatory compensation decision or other practice" should be read broadly, and to include any practice—including, for example, seniority or pension practices—that impact overall compensation.

I urge adoption of The Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 181, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009. As an original cosponsor of H.R. 11, the House passed version of this bill, I would like to express my appreciation for the efforts of Chairman GEORGE MILLER for his instrumental efforts in ensuring passage of this vital legislation. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act will strengthen protections against discrimination and safeguard the civil liberties of our Nation's employees.

Through the passage of this legislation, we correct the injustice that occurred following the unlawful discrimination against Ms. Lilly Ledbetter. After nearly 2 decades of service to the Goodyear Tire and Rubber facility in Alabama, Ms. Ledbetter discovered that she was the lowest-paid supervisor at the plant, despite having more experience than several of her male colleagues.

When Ms. Ledbetter sued her employer, a jury found that she had been the victim of unlawful discrimination. The Supreme Court

agreed, but nonetheless upheld Goodyear's appeal on the ground that Ms. Ledbetter was barred from challenging the discriminatory payments. The Supreme Court's reason was that the time limit for bringing her claim had passed as the initial discriminatory decision had occurred 20 years earlier. In dismissing Ms. Ledbetter's claim, the Supreme Court overruled a previous law under which every discriminatory paycheck was a new violation that restarted the clock for filing a claim.

The Supreme Court's decision put workers who were subject to discrimination at an extreme disadvantage. As Ms. Ledbetter's case shows, it is very difficult for employees to discover pay discrimination, and workers may not discover pay discrimination for many years after they are discriminated against. Under the Supreme Court's decision, many victims of this deplorable practice would be left without recourse.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court's decision encourages employers to keep a discriminatory pay decision secret for 180 days, allowing them to pay the discriminatory the rest of a worker's career.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons the Supreme Court's decision rendered much of our civil rights law virtually unenforceable. This was a decision that affected not only gender discrimination, but also discrimination on the grounds of race, ethnicity and sexuality. I am therefore proud to support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the Senate bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McKEON. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McKeon moves to commit the bill S. 181, Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to commit this bill to the committee so that this bill, which is so sweeping in its scope, be given an opportunity to be debated in a comprehensive fashion. To this day, this committee has never had a hearing on this bill.

There has not been a full and fair debate, regular order has not been followed, and it needs to be. As I noted in my remarks, we have not entertained, in the three times that this bill has been brought to the floor, a single Republican amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I rise to speak against the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this motion to commit is clearly an effort to not only send this bill back to committee, but to kill this legislation. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle recognize the situation that we find ourselves in. The House has passed this legislation earlier, in this session, and the Senate has passed similar legislation which we are now taking up. And when we vote in a little while, this afternoon, we will pass this legislation, and it will go to the President of the United States.

So this is a desperate attempt to somehow keep that from happening. And what we will be sweeping is we will be sweeping away a policy of discrimination in the workplace against women who are paid less than their male counterparts for the same work.

The fact of the matter is that there were hearings held both in the Judiciary Committee, in the last session of Congress, and in the Education and Labor Committee, and all sides were allowed to present their views in those hearings.

□ 1545

In the last Congress, it was subject to a full committee markup, which all Members could have offered as many amendments as they like. They offered two amendments. Those amendments were rejected. They could have offered more. They chose not to.

The bill went to the House floor, debated, and was passed on a bipartisan vote of 225–199 in June of 2007. The minority had an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit. They chose not to. The bill went to the Senate, where it was filibustered. Filibustered. And then the bill was reintroduced identical to what the House had already passed earlier this month.

On January 9 of this year, we passed the bill on the House floor again, 247–171, on another bipartisan vote. The minority had another opportunity to offer a motion to recommit. They chose not to.

The bill went to the Senate, where it was subjected to amendment after amendment. The bill was passed on a bipartisan vote of 61–36. And now we are on the cusp of sending this bill to President Obama for his signature. That is what we should do.

We should reject this motion to commit, an attempt to kill this legislation, and make sure that this bill goes to the President's desk and ends this discriminatory policy against women in the workplace. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to commit and vote “aye” on the passage of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 176, nays 250, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—176

Aderholt	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Gerlach	Myrick
Austria	Gringey (GA)	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gohmert	Nunes
Bachus	Goodlatte	Olson
Barrett (SC)	Granger	Paul
Bartlett	Graves	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Pence
Biggert	Guthrie	Petri
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bilirakis	Harper	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Heller	Posey
Blunt	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Boehner	Herger	Putnam
Bonner	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Bono Mack	Hunter	Rehberg
Boozman	Inglis	Reichert
Boustany	Issa	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Jones	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Rooney
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	King (NY)	Roskam
Calvert	Kingston	Royce
Camp	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Campbell	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Cantor	Lamborn	Schmidt
Cao	Lance	Schock
Capito	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Carter	LaTourette	Sessions
Castle	Latta	Shadegg
Chaffetz	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Childers	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Coble	Linder	Simpson
Coffman (CO)	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Cole	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Souder
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Davis (KY)	E.	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Mack	Terry
Dent	Manzullo	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Dreier	McCaul	Turner
Duncan	McClintock	Upton
Ehlers	McCotter	Walden
Emerson	McHenry	Wamp
Fallin	McHugh	Westmoreland
Flake	McKeon	Whitfield
Fleming	McMorris	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Rodgers	Wittman
Fortenberry	Mica	Wolf
Fox	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	

NAYS—250

Abercrombie	Baca	Berkley
Ackerman	Baird	Berman
Adler (NJ)	Baldwin	Berry
Altmire	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Bean	Bishop (NY)
Arcuri	Becerra	Blumenauer

Bocieri	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)
Boren	Hirono	Payne
Boswell	Hodes	Perlmutter
Boucher	Holden	Perriello
Boyd	Holt	Peters
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Bright	Inslee	Polis (CO)
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Pomeroy
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Capuano	(TX)	Rangel
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Carney	Kagen	Rodriguez
Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Ross
Cassidy	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Royal-Allard
Chandler	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Clarke	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kilroy	Salazar
Cleaver	Kind	Sanchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	T.
Cohen	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly (VA)	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kosmas	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kratovil	Schauer
Costa	Kucinich	Schiff
Costello	Langevin	Schrader
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Levin	Serrano
Dahlkemper	Lewis (GA)	Sestak
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuler
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Sires
DeFazio	Lujan	Skelton
DeGette	Maffei	Slaughter
Delahunt	Maloney	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Markey (CO)	Snyder
Dicks	Markey (MA)	Solis (CA)
Dingell	Marshall	Space
Doggett	Massa	Speier
Donnelly (IN)	Matheson	Spratt
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Driehaus	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Edwards (MD)	McCollum	Sutton
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Tanner
Ellison	McGovern	Tauscher
Ellsworth	McIntyre	Taylor
Engel	McMahon	Teague
Eshoo	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Filner	Melancon	Titus
Foster	Michaud	Tonko
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Towns
Fudge	Miller, George	Tsongas
Giffords	Minnick	Van Hollen
Gonzalez	Mitchell	Velázquez
Gordon (TN)	Mollohan	Visclosky
Grayson	Moore (KS)	Walz
Green, Al	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Moran (VA)	Schultz
Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	Waters
Gutierrez	Murphy, Patrick	Watson
Hall (NY)	Murtha	Watt
Halvorson	Nadler (NY)	Waxman
Hare	Napolitano	Weiner
Harman	Neal (MA)	Welch
Hastings (FL)	Nye	Wexler
Heinrich	Oberstar	Wilson (OH)
Herseth Sandlin	Obey	Woolsey
Higgins	Oliver	Wu
Hill	Ortiz	Yarmuth
Himes	Pallone	
Hinchey	Pascarell	

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1615

Messrs. CONNOLLY of Virginia, ADLER of New Jersey, LUJÁN, JACKSON of Illinois, HOYER, BOREN, KLEIN of Florida, GUTIERREZ, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. BEAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Messrs. HILL, TANNER, GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. CARNEY, SESTAK, MINNICK, BERMAN, CARDOZA, CUELLAR, OLIVER, Mrs. MALONEY

and Mr. SPRATT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LUMMIS and Messrs. BILBRAY, COLE, LATHAM and HERGER changed their vote from “nay” to yea.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 36, I inadvertently voted “nay.” I meant to vote “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 177, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie	Doyle	Kucinich
Ackerman	Driehaus	Lance
Adler (NJ)	Edwards (MD)	Langevin
Altmire	Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Andrews	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Arcuri	Ellsworth	Lee (CA)
Baca	Engel	Levin
Baird	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Baldwin	Farr	Lipinski
Barrow	Fattah	Loeb sack
Bean	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Becerra	Foster	Lowey
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Lujan
Berman	Fudge	Maffei
Berry	Giffords	Maloney
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	Markey (CO)
Bishop (NY)	Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)
Blumenauer	Grayson	Marshall
Bocciari	Green, Al	Massa
Boswell	Green, Gene	Matheson
Boucher	Grijalva	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA)	Hall (NY)	McCollum
Brown, Corrine	Halvorson	McDermott
Butterfield	Hare	McGovern
Capps	Harman	McIntyre
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McMahon
Cardoza	Heinrich	McNerney
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Meek (FL)
Carney	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Carson (IN)	Hill	Melancon
Castor (FL)	Himes	Michaud
Chandler	Hinches	Miller (NC)
Clarke	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Clay	Hirono	Minnick
Cleaver	Hodes	Mitchell
Clyburn	Holden	Mollohan
Cohen	Holt	Moore (KS)
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Moore (WI)
Conyers	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Cooper	Inslee	Murphy (CT)
Costa	Israel	Murphy, Patrick
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
Courtney	Jackson-Lee	Nadler (NY)
Crowley	(TX)	Napolitano
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Nye
Dahlkemper	Kagen	Oberstar
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Obey
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Oliver
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Ortiz
Davis (TN)	Kildee	Pascarell
DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ)
DeGette	Kilroy	Payne
Delahunt	Kind	Pelosi
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter
Dicks	Kissell	Perriello
Dingell	Klein (FL)	Peters
Doggett	Kosmas	Peterson
Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)

Polis (CO)	Scott (VA)
Pomeroy	Serrano
Price (NC)	Sestak
Rahall	Shea-Porter
Rangel	Sherman
Reyes	Shuler
Richardson	Sires
Rodriguez	Skelton
Ross	Slaughter
Rothman (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)
Ruppersberger	Snyder
Rush	Solis (CA)
Ryan (OH)	Space
Salazar	Speier
Sanchez, Linda T.	Spratt
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark
Sarbanes	Stupak
Schakowsky	Sutton
Schauer	Tanner
Schiff	Tauscher
Schrader	Taylor
Schwartz	Teague
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)
	Thompson (MS)

NAYS—177

Aderholt	Fortenberry	Miller (FL)
Akin	Fox	Miller (MI)
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary
Austria	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Bachmann	Gallegly	Murphy, Tim
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Bartlett	Gingrey (GA)	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Olson
Biggert	Goodlatte	Paul
Bilbray	Granger	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Graves	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Petri
Blackburn	Guthrie	Pitts
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Platts
Boehner	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Bono Mack	Heller	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hensarling	Putnam
Boren	Herger	Radanovich
Boustany	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Boyd	Hunter	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Inglis	Roe (TN)
Bright	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jones	Rooney
Burton (IN)	Jordan (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	King (IA)	Roskam
Calvert	King (NY)	Royce
Camp	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Campbell	Kirk	Scalise
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Cao	Lamborn	Schock
Capito	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Carter	LaTourette	Sessions
Cassidy	Latta	Shadegg
Hastings (FL)	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Chaffetz	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Childers	Linder	Simpson
Coble	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Coffman (CO)	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Cole	Luetkemeyer	Souder
Conaway	Lummis	Stearns
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel E.	Sullivan
Culberson	Mack	Terry
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Thompson (PA)
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Thornberry
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCaul	Turner
Diaz-Balart, M.	McClintock	Upton
Dreier	McCotter	Walden
Duncan	McHenry	Wamp
Ehlers	McHugh	Westmoreland
Emerson	McKeon	Wilson (SC)
Fallin	McMorris	Wittman
Flake	Rodgers	Wolf
Fleming	Mica	Young (FL)
Forbes		

NOT VOTING—6

Brown-Waite,	Lynch	Young (AK)
Ginny	Pallone	
Etheridge	Tiberi	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1625

So the Senate bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Pending any declaration of the House into the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 88 for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1—which contains an emergency designation for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles—the Chair must put the question of consideration under clause 10(c)(3) of rule XXI.

The question is, “Will the House now consider the bill?”

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

AYES—224

Abercrombie	Driehaus	Kucinich
Ackerman	Edwards (MD)	Langevin
Adler (NJ)	Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Altmire	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Andrews	Engel	Lee (CA)
Baca	Eshoo	Levin
Baird	Farr	Lewis (GA)
Baldwin	Fattah	Lipinski
Bean	Filner	Loeb sack
Becerra	Foster	Lofgren, Zoe
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Berman	Fudge	Lujan
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	Maffei
Bishop (NY)	Gordon (TN)	Maloney
Blumenauer	Grayson	Markey (CO)
Bocciari	Green, Al	Markey (MA)
Boswell	Green, Gene	Massa
Boucher	Grijalva	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Hall (NY)	McCollum
Brown, Corrine	Halvorson	McDermott
Butterfield	Hare	McGovern
Capps	Harman	McMahon
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Cardoza	Heinrich	Meek (FL)
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)
Carney	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Carson (IN)	Hill	Miller, George
Castor (FL)	Himes	Mitchell
Chandler	Hinches	Mollohan
Clarke	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Clay	Hirono	Moore (WI)
Cleaver	Hodes	Moran (VA)
Clyburn	Holden	Murphy (CT)
Cohen	Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Murtha
Conyers	Hoyer	Nadler (NY)
Cooper	Inslee	Napolitano
Costa	Israel	Neal (MA)
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Nye
Courtney	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Crowley	(TX)	Obey
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Oliver
Dahlkemper	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Davis (AL)	Kagen	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pascarell
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Payne
DeFazio	Kilroy	Pelosi
DeGette	Kind	Perlmutter
Delahunt	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perriello
DeLauro	Kissell	Peters
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Dingell	Kosmas	Polis (CO)
Doggett		
Doyle		

Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz

NOES—199

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming

NOT VOTING—10

Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Etheridge
Kingston

Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Gerlach
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1642

Mr. BOSWELL changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, today, I was unexpectedly detained and missed one vote.

On rollcall No. 38, on the question of consideration of the bill H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, I would have voted “aye.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 88 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1643

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, with Mr. TIERNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 3½ hours, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, who may yield control of blocks of that time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 1 hour and 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1645

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this country is facing what most economists, I believe, consider to be the most serious and the most dangerous economic situation in our lifetimes, certainly going back to the early thirties.

If you take a look at what has happened in the country, late last year, former President George Bush recognized that the world's credit markets were near a state of total collapse, and he asked this Congress to take unprecedented action in order to try to prevent that. Since that time, we've seen a continued unraveling of financial markets, we've seen a continued unrav-

eling of the housing markets, and we've seen the most spectacular loss of consumer confidence in the modern history of this country. New claims for unemployment insurance last week hit 590,000. In the last 2 months alone, we've seen this country lose more than a million jobs.

Consumer purchasing power has evaporated. New home starts fell 15 percent in December, to the lowest number on record going back more than 50 years. And we've seen other evidence of panic in the marketplace and on Main Street.

Normally, when consumer purchasing power collapses, our government uses the tool of monetary policy in order to try to resurrect and reinflate the economy. The problem is we've already shot that bullet. The Federal Reserve has taken phenomenal actions to try to stabilize the situation to very moderate effect. And now we're being asked to consider the other tool in our arsenal. We're being asked to use fiscal policy to expand consumer purchasing power to try and stop the slide. And that is what this proposal before us here today will try to do.

In most recessions, we're eventually led out of those recessions through the leadership of the housing sector and the automobile sector. This time around, both of those sectors are in shambles, and they're not likely to lead anybody out of anything. So that leaves us with very limited tools.

This package today that we are considering is an \$825 billion package that does a variety of things to try to re-inflate the economy. It, first of all, provides tax cuts—which Mr. RANGEL will discuss—in order to try to put some money in people's pockets. We hope that that succeeds to a greater extent than the last round of tax rebates did.

Secondly, this package attempts to jump-start job creation through infrastructure investments in roads, bridges, sewers, water repair, modernizing our electric power grid and expanding broadband access so that all parts of the country have an opportunity to compete, with Internet access.

Third, this package attempts to help those who are most impacted by the recession, who are losing their jobs, their health insurance, and losing the ability to send their kids to college.

Fourth, this package attempts to modernize the economy—or at least to begin a long process of doing that—by accelerating the development of new technology through key investments in science and energy.

And last, it attempts, also, to save jobs by stabilizing State and local budgets. Because of the economic collapse and because of the collapse of revenue now forecast at the State and local level, States face the need to eliminate gargantuan deficits because they're required to balance their budgets. Without help from the Federal Government to stabilize their situation, they will be forced to impose

major tax increases and devastating service cutbacks, which under these economic conditions would be hugely counterproductive. This package attempts to do all of those things.

Now, none of us can be certain about the degree of success that would flow from passage of this package.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

But the fact is we are as close as we will ever see to being in the same position that Franklin Roosevelt was in in the thirties. And at that time he tried some things; some of the things he tried worked, some of them didn't, and so he moved on and tried other things.

There is no person on this floor who can guarantee the success of this package. Certainly, standing alone, this package will not succeed, because it is going to have to be accompanied by further actions to build confidence in the economy. It is going to have to be accompanied by new actions to prevent massive house foreclosures all across the country. We are going to probably have to have even further intervention in the financial markets of the country. And this package that we have here today, the spending portion of this package, may very well undershoot rather than overshoot the target that many economists have set out for us.

When President Bush came to office, I was divided in my judgment about whether I should support his first major new initiative, which was the No Child Left Behind education package. I had grave misgivings about that package, but in the end I supported it, largely because I thought that, as the incoming President, the President deserves to have the benefit of the doubt. President Obama is in that same situation, only in far more dire straits. He has asked the Congress to pass an economic recovery package, and this bill today is attempting to do that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

He has asked us to provide a reasonable balance between tax cuts and spending increases to revive the ability of consumers to purchase the goods and services produced by this society. Unless someone has a clearly better idea, I think we have an obligation to support the President's proposal, at this point as the only game in town. The risks are enormous if we do not move ahead.

Everyone talks, for instance, about how disappointed they are with what the previous Bush administration did with respect to the package on Wall Street. I'm certainly extremely unhappy with some of the actions taken by Secretary Paulson.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I believe, nonetheless, that the President was right at the time in telling

the Congress that if we did not take action, the results could have been catastrophic. I believe if we do not take action on this package today, the results can be similarly catastrophic. And with that, I urge Members to support the package.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

As we begin today's debate, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I'd like to reiterate my willingness and desire to work with President Obama.

Mr. President, each of us wants to see you be successful, and we welcome the opportunity to work with you and your administration. The challenges we face as Americans—not Democrats or Republicans, but Americans—are great. We have much work to do.

Mr. President, it is our sincere hope that we will work together across party lines to restore confidence in our economy and create a climate conducive to job growth. We can no longer afford to point fingers and cast blame. If there was ever a time for our country to come together, it is now.

There is no greater challenge facing working families today than our Nation's struggling economy. Each of us can speak passionately and with great empathy of people we know in our own districts who have lost their jobs, are unable to pay their mortgage, don't have health insurance, or are struggling to make ends meet. They are asking for our help. As we demonstrate our compassion, let us also be mindful of our responsibility to assist those in need without creating an untenable situation for future generations. That is the balance we must strive to achieve.

The centerpiece of any stimulus bill ought to be job creation. Government has a role; but our constituents are not asking for an unlimited expansion of government. They are asking Congress to focus on specific sectors of our economy and to provide solutions that will offer tangible, near-term results.

Most of us would agree that the recent \$700 billion Troubled Asset Relief Program, known as TARP, is an illustration of how good intentions don't always deliver desired results. Many Members, I'm sure, would like to have their vote back if they voted for that package.

When Congress spends too much too quickly, it doesn't think through the details and oversight becomes more difficult. The TARP bill is only the most recent example. The lesson learned was this; we cannot manage what we do not measure. We simply cannot afford to make the same mistake again.

Public dismay over the lack of transparency in TARP implies a public desire for more openness and thoughtful consideration of stimulus spending. A Web site is not oversight. Posting \$606 billion worth of Federal spending on a Web site does not ensure that these

funds will be well spent. Each and every agency should be required to submit a spending plan to Congress—on the front end, not after the fact—to ensure that every dollar is spent as intended. Our constituents, Mr. Chairman and Members, deserve no less.

These taxpayers, who will repay this debt over time, also deserve specific answers before we spend another nickel of their money. They deserve to know how many jobs will be created in 6 months, 12 months, 18 months, or longer. They deserve to know where these jobs will be created, how many of these jobs will be skilled and unskilled positions, and whether these jobs will be sustained through higher taxes or even more government spending down the road. These are thoughtful, reasonable questions deserving a thoughtful and reasonable response.

Many have described this legislation as a transportation and infrastructure investment package. However, the fact remains that only \$30 billion, or 3 percent of the funding, is directed towards "shovel-ready" road and highway spending. The backlog of these projects is some \$64.3 billion. Similarly, \$4.5 billion is allocated for the Corps of Engineers for improving flood protection and navigation, when a \$61 billion backlog exists for Corps projects that are fully authorized. These are the types of targeted infrastructure investments that will create sustainable jobs and should be given even greater priority within this package.

Many Republicans support wellness programs, analog TV conversion coupons, and the NEA, for example, but these and many other items in this bill don't create jobs and ought to be funded through our regular appropriations process. They do not belong in a stimulus bill.

□ 1700

Nor should a stimulus package be used to establish 32 new government programs at a cost of some \$136 billion, which this bill does. Thirty-seven percent of the appropriated dollars in this package, more than \$1 out of every \$3, is dedicated to creating new government programs.

Are we fostering job creation and economic stimulus, or are we simply growing the size of government? I know my taxpayers are asking. How about yours?

Our opposition to this package is not based on partisan politics but on economic reality. There is tremendous pressure on Congress to maintain funding of existing programs even before we create new ones. Again, let's take off our partisan hats and look at the sobering facts before us.

Congress recently provided \$700 billion for TARP. It's now considering \$816 billion in this stimulus bill. There is talk of the Senate's adding another \$70 billion to address the AMT fix. Congress will next week, consider a \$410 billion omnibus spending bill for the

work we didn't finish last year. And before long we will be considering another emergency supplemental spending bill.

Let's be perfectly honest. All these spending bills are placing a tremendous burden of debt on present and future generations. Our projected deficit of 2009 is already approaching \$1.2 trillion, the largest in history, even before we consider this stimulus proposal.

So what can be done to make this a better and perhaps even a bipartisan spending bill? Let me offer four suggestions, Mr. Chairman:

First, narrow the focus of this bill to those items that provide measurable economic stimulus or produce jobs. Spending should be targeted to key infrastructure investments that will create jobs over the next 2 years. We don't question the urgency of this package. We question its priorities and its price tag.

Secondly, address public concerns over adequate transparency and accountability by requiring agencies to submit a spending plan before they start spending the money in this package, as we did in the 9/11 package. Such an approach will ensure that every dollar is spent as intended.

Further, I would suggest that this bill should ensure that it captures the full costs associated with waiving cost-sharing requirements and hiring of additional Federal employees. Proper safeguards are needed to prevent the unintentional growth of government over time.

And, lastly, limit the use of the stimulus bill as a vehicle for increasing base funding of popular domestic programs. Large increases in these programs create unrealistic expectations for future spending.

I will conclude my remarks as I began them with a message for our new President:

Mr. President, the challenges we face transcend partisan politics. We have an historic opportunity to work together to craft a stimulus package that Republicans and Democrats can support. We appeal to you to include us in this process. We wish you and your family Godspeed and welcome the opportunity to work with you, Mr. President.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I yield 15 minutes to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL; 15 minutes to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WAXMAN; 10 minutes to the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. MILLER; 10 minutes to the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR; 5 minutes to Ms. GIFFORDS of the Science and Technology Committee; 5 minutes to the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ; 5 minutes to

the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT; and 2 minutes to the chairman of the Government Investigations Committee, Mr. TOWNS.

The CHAIR. Members so designated will control the time mentioned.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, someone once said that when the going gets tough, the tough get going. I think of our great country, knowing that through the Depression, that's just what happened. We came back stronger, more competitive, and became a nation that was respected. I remember so clearly in 1941 they thought America was a loser. We almost lost our entire fleet. But what happened after that? Again America came back stronger as a world power economically and militarily. And now we're in trouble again.

This \$275 billion bill brings relief. The Ways and Means Committee is proud to bring this to you for your consideration. It doesn't help our banks. It doesn't help our fiscal institutions. They don't cry. But those of us who go back home know who's doing the crying: those people who work hard every day, and yet they're losing their jobs, they're losing their dignity, they're losing their homes, they can't put food on the table.

There is only one way to do it, and that is to be equitable and to make certain that we have a decent and fair response to their tax relief, and that's what we intend to do.

We provide \$144 million to people who work every day to put food on the table, to be able to get clothes for their children. And the reason they don't have confidence is because they don't have money, and we provide that for them. For families that are low income that have children, we try to provide something not only for those people who don't have tax liability immediately but to relieve them of that payroll tax, because at the end of the day, it's what you take home and not what you call it.

For working families we have the earned income tax credit. And we tried desperately hard to make certain that for those people who have lost their jobs that they not lose their dignity, they not lose their health insurance, and that they be able to get education and retraining.

For small businesses, unless we have the people who are working that have resources to be able to buy, we try to help our small businesses by giving them an easy opportunity to depreciate and to buy equipment and not to have to lay off.

And one of the most important parts of our bill is something that they'll never be able to take away from our great country, and that is education and technology training. So we can

come back stronger. We can come back notwithstanding what's happening here. And I can't see anybody in this House going back home saying we didn't do enough because for those that are out there feeling the pain of what we're going through, they are just waiting for relief to be coming. And our President has promised this, our leadership has promised this, and this is the time for the Congress to be a part of that.

The health information technology is not only going to save lives, it's going to be able to say at the end of the day that we moved forward to make our country healthier, better educated, knowing more about technology. And once we do that, when people ask how are you going to pay back the money, you don't pay it as a sick Nation. You pay it back as an educated, healthy Nation that restored the dignity and prosperity that we know. And so we find Members will have ribbons on, and I refer you to the RECORD to know more about the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the original chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee of Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS.

(Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that the Congress must act swiftly and boldly to counteract the downturn in the economy. But there's a difference between actions that are swift and bold and spending huge sums of borrowed money irresponsibly.

When the dust finally settles on this boondoggle, perhaps then we will face the facts regarding this colossal trillion dollar spending bill. And the fact is that the Pelosi-Obey bill isn't an economic stimulus plan at all, but a rampant spending spree, much of which has nothing to do with bailing out a sagging economy, but with a liberal litany of left-leaning, big government programs.

We need a true stimulus bill. That much we can all agree on. But it needs to be aimed directly at creating jobs. It needs to give real incentives to small businesses, which create three out of four new jobs in the country. It needs to have a strict oversight program, given the recent TARP fiasco. And it needs to solely focus on stimulating the economy, not a mandate to overspend on a broad range of government programs.

First, this bill is not aimed directly at job creation. According to the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan office, only 40 percent of the discretionary funds in this bill will actually stimulate the economy and create jobs by 2010. Economists all across the Nation question the wisdom of the U.S. Government's competing for debt financing, when our small businesses are

struggling to refinance their own debt. How does squeezing out our small business owners help create jobs in this troubled economy?

Editorial boards across the country are questioning the spending priorities that have needlessly crept into this bill: \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$200 million for tree trimming and sod planting on the National Mall, \$150 million for Smithsonian facility upgrades, \$16 billion in Pell grants for college students.

To quote *The Washington Post*, which I rarely do: "All of those ideas may have merit, but why do they belong in an emergency measure aimed to kick-start the economy?"

If the majority wants to debate funding for the arts, let's do it in the annual Interior Appropriations bill. If the majority wants to increase Pell grant funding, bring it up through the annual education spending bill that's coming up shortly. And if you want to go out and borrow another \$825 billion from your children in the name of saving the economy, we should demand that it be spent producing jobs for Americans.

The true drivers of this economy, the small business owners, are literally left out in the cold. While we're planting sod and cleaning up trash on the National Mall to the tune of \$200 million, we are only allocating a fraction of that amount to our small business owners across the Nation in the form of tax breaks. It's not hard to see where the true priorities lie with this majority.

Second, who knows where this money will go? The bill fails to demand a full accounting of the funds before they are allocated. Last week's disapproval vote of more TARP funds would make you think that we'd learned a thing or two about writing a blank check to the administration without seeing how they intend to spend it. But apparently we haven't.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. When the Appropriations Committee considered this legislation last week, the minority put forth several thoughtful, fiscally-responsible proposals to prioritize infrastructure investment and demand greater accountability, all denied on a party-line vote.

I proposed an amendment that withheld a portion of these funds until a simple spending plan was submitted to Congress, a plan requiring expenditure details, all rejected. It's a sad day when the majority won't even allow the formulation of a plan before spending bonanzas begin.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be about encouraging our small businesses to create jobs and providing the proper oversight and accountability that working families deserve. Unfortunately, this bill fails miserably on both counts.

If money is no object, if success is not your goal, if accountability is not important to you, vote for this bill. But I urge Members to oppose this bill and support a bill that actually creates jobs and demands accountability for the taxpayers.

□ 1715

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), who will share with you our concern about people who have lost their jobs.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, every day and every corner of this Nation, and every sector of this economy, the casualties keep mounting. Seventy-five thousand people lost their jobs yesterday, at Alcoa, Boeing, Caterpillar, Home Depot, Intel, Microsoft, Pfizer, Sprint, Texas Instruments and many small businesses. Over 11 million Americans have already lost their jobs, the highest level in 25 years, and every major economist says it's going to get worse before it gets better.

Behind every number is a personal story of an American family struggling to cope with and survive this economic crisis. Behind every story is an American who deserves our help, who has earned our help on the job and has every right to expect Congress to act with all deliberate speed. We must not let them down.

Helping these Americans while they look for work is not only the right thing to do for them, it is the only thing we can do in our economy. Unemployment insurance is one of the most effective forms of economic stimulus, because jobless Americans have little choice but to spend the money that's given them.

Every unemployment insurance dollar spent returns an economic impact of \$1.64. That's the kind of significant return on investment that will help America restart its economic engine. This recovery engine responds to rising unemployment with a historic level of assistance. It provides \$27 billion for a program of extended benefits. For the first time ever, this legislation provides financial incentives for States to modernize their unemployment insurance programs and increase access to benefits.

For the first time ever, this legislation provides a Federal supplement to increase unemployment benefits by an extra \$100 a month for the next year, and, again for the first time, we will provide assistance to unemployed workers who are trying to afford health care coverage. The primary goal of this legislation is to create jobs, but we must also help the unemployed as those jobs are being created, and this measure does just that. By voting for this bill, we are standing up for the American people and standing alongside the American people right where we belong.

I urge support for this critically important legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a member of the committee.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill really ignores the major issue that we are really facing. Our Nation is fundamentally broke, but we have \$57 trillion of unfunded obligations. The Ways and Means Committee, with all due respect, is doing nothing about dealing with this issue.

I have a bill in with JIM COOPER and Senator CONRAD, Senators CONRAD and GREGG have it over on the Senate side, that creates a bipartisan commission similar to what we did on the Iraq Study Group with every spending program, including Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security and tax policy. Some on my side won't like that, a tax policy on the table, and we give the commission 1 year to go around the country holding public hearings, coming up with a proposal to require, to require this institution that has fundamentally failed to do its responsibility.

Now, China holds a large portion of our debt. People talk about it, but yet nobody does anything about it. If the Chair of the Ways and Means Committee gets on the train in Washington and takes it to New York City and looks to the right and to the left, the factories are in decay. There is graffiti all over the walls, the windows are broken. You come through my old neighborhood in Philadelphia, and it's in decay.

By doing this, by getting control of our spending in a way that would honestly do it in a bipartisan way, I would tell the Chair of the committee, we would bring about a renaissance in this Nation whereby we would have the ability to invest in Alzheimer's research and autism research and cancer research and manufacturing to create new jobs that really show that America is back. So I think the failure of this bill is that this provision is not in it.

The last issue is, I call it the father amendment or the mother amendment or the grandmother/grandmother amendment, all of us at some time are going to get an opportunity, and we are going to leave here. And our grandkids are going to say, you know, Dad, when you were there, or Mom, when you were there, or Grandpop, when you were there, or Grandmom, when you were there, did you know that China was buying our debt up? Did you know the Saudis were buying our debt up? Did you really know, Grandfather or Grandmother, that our factories were in decay? Did you know that they controlled our debt? Did you? Did you, Pop? Pop, did you do anything about it? Dad, did you do anything about it?

And the answer is, as of now, this Congress, and let me just say, both political parties, have fundamentally

failed. So you are going to have to tell your kids and your grandkids, no.

When I was there, as of January of 2009, we did nothing, and we allowed our country to fall into decline. This amendment ought to be, it ought to be in the Republican substitute, and it's not, and I voted against the Republican substitute. It ought to be in this, and it's not, and I voted against this. And if this does not pass, Barack Obama will preside over the decline of this Nation when he is running for reelection as President of this Nation in 4 years.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who is going to share with us his dreams about a country that is not dependent on fossil fuel.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman's recognition. I appreciate Mr. LEVIN's courtesy.

I have been listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle. These are the architects of the Bush economic meltdown, who have given him billions and billions and billions of borrowed dollars, blank checks, to the last administration. All of a sudden, they are fiscally interested.

Well, let me just say, we just left a Budget Committee meeting where we had five brilliant respected Ph.D.s from all across the spectrum who said we are on uncharted water, you should err on the side of a larger stimulus, not a smaller, and that one of the most important areas deals with energy.

I am proud that we have taken these provisions that we have been dancing around for the last 3 or 4 years and playing Russian roulette with where the private sector couldn't invest in them. It was on again, off again. Now we have made them certain and indefinite. We have encouraged these investments by increasing the level and giving them a longer period of time to cope with them.

I think all of us ought to embrace this. These are provisions that are investing in our energy future. They are going to create jobs, they are going to fight global warming, and they are going to help us in the international arena.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was in a meeting today with the Republican Party and President Obama, and we pledged to work with him to turn this economy around, and we feel very serious about working with the President on a bipartisan basis.

But as we look at the stimulus package, I don't think this is quite what he had in mind. Only 7 percent of the appropriation goes to shovel-ready projects, only 13 percent in general goes to public works-type projects. At that rate it spends \$275,000 per job, and the household income for America is about \$50,000. This is not bold enough in terms of job creation for the targeted 3 to 4 million jobs.

The second part is this bill creates 32 brand new Federal programs at a cost of \$136 billion, new spending, and yet we didn't have hearings on all of these new programs.

Then it has extension of some spending that we already have, millions of dollars for contraceptives, \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$200 million for grass resodding on The Mall. In fact, for every \$1 in small business tax relief, this bill gives \$4 to resod The National Mall, and \$600 million to prepare the country for universal health care.

And then, as Mr. WOLF said, we are going to talk about the debt. Our Nation is \$10.6 trillion in debt.

Now, the worst Republican deficit was \$412 billion. The Democrats this quarter will exceed \$1 trillion in deficit spending and, as Mr. WALZ said, we owe \$3 trillion to other countries, led by China.

I sit on the Agriculture Committee. We have about \$26 billion in the Agriculture portion of this bill, but only \$1.7 billion is spent on public works, things that will create jobs. The rest of it is traditional left-wing spending, expansion of the Food Stamp Program, even though food stamps has an automatic enrollment, and it also has an automatic inflation guard. But we are increasing food stamps.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. This changes our \$400 million loan program to extend broadband, changes it to a \$2.8 billion grant program, thus creating one of the largest corporate welfare elements that's out there—and I don't know how that creates jobs—and \$23 million for the Inspector General for audits, and how does that create jobs. There are better ways.

We should reduce unfunded mandates, we should increase the public works, we should have more tax cuts for small business, we should implement the SAFE Act, and we should reward responsible behavior.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. All Members are advised not to traffic in the well when a Member is under recognition, as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to say I apologize.

Mr. DICKS. Well, I accept the gentleman's apology, but he was inaccurate on what he said. That is something I cannot forgive him for.

Out of the \$200 million for The Mall, \$150 million is to save the Jefferson Monument from sinking, sinking, into the Tidal Basin. Only part of the money is used to resod the grass, and, there is money also to protect and restore the Sylvan Theater as well.

There is a national group that has organized to restore The National Mall.

We just saw \$1.8 million Americans come and stand on that Mall. It is a national treasure. It is part of the Park Service. It deserves to be fixed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater challenge facing our families and businesses today with our Nation's struggling economy. The past few months have been absolutely traumatic for many. There is genuine anxiety and fear about job security, loss of savings, a serious drop in home values and the decline of the value of personal investments.

As a result, consumer confidence is at historic lows. Quite correctly, Americans are asking for help. We must respond by passing an economic package as quickly as possible. However, we must make sure that that response is effective, efficient and timely.

Unfortunately, the bill the majority has placed before us today does not meet those common-sense standards. Clearly, many Americans find themselves in real trouble and in need of relief. Provisions of this bill, such as the extended unemployment benefits, nutrition assistance and job training are critically important to help many Americans struggle through hard times. However, they have little to do with creating 3 to 4 million jobs.

However, there is a significant role for government to play in the targeted infrastructure, investment, roads, tunnels, bridges, sewers, flood control.

□ 1730

As Mr. LEWIS said earlier, many of the majority have described this legislation as a transportation and infrastructure investment package. However, only \$30 billion of that, or 3 percent of the funding, is directed towards shovel-ready road and highway spending that would immediately create jobs. And there's a \$61 billion backlog in Army Corps projects that could be addressed immediately.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, less than half the spending in this stimulus package will be paid out in the next 2 years. At that rate, an economic recovery will probably outrun most of that spending.

This should worry all Americans. This isn't just a stimulus package; it is legislation jam packed with a lot of domestic spending, even if there's no evidence that that spending will create jobs or prevent layoffs.

I note that the majority proposes a \$79 billion State stabilization fund. Apparently, this program is designed to bail out some—I repeat—some States that did little to control their own spending and bonded indebtedness in recent years.

Take my own State of New Jersey as an example. In the last 6 years, New Jersey State spending has increased by

\$11 billion, and our State's debt has more than doubled to \$36 billion. Clearly, this is not a picture of restraint. Add to that picture some of the highest taxes in income taxes in the Nation.

In other words, while the Federal budget deficit has exploded, Federal taxpayers are now supposed to pull some State governments out of a fiscal hole that was partially of their own making.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to quote CBO, we ought to quote CBO accurately. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has said that, in their estimate, 65 percent of the money in this bill will be spent in the next 2 years. The administration's estimate is 75 percent.

I would point out CBO also says that over the next 2 years this bill will inject \$526 billion into the economy, and they state that the implementation of this bill "would have a noticeable impact on economic growth and employment in the next few years." That is a whole lot better than doing nothing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, there is no argument that our economy is on a downhill slide. Chairman OBEY conveyed that very well in his opening remarks. But there is an argument on how we get out of this economic slide downwards.

The bill before us is based on the philosophy that government spending will stir the economy. It will not. Historically, we know that bailouts and government spending simply don't work.

During the Great Depression, high Federal spending did not save our economy. Instead, it remained stagnant. World War II built the industrial base. And it was in the 1950s, with the private sector, that drove us to a number one economy in the world.

In the 1990s, Japan tried to stimulate their economy with the bailout of banks and with federal government spending. They borrowed the equivalent of \$250 billion and spent it. What happened? Their economy remained stagnant, and their average per capita income went from second in the world to tenth in the world.

This bill has the same idea that failed in the 1930s and failed in Japan: borrowed money, Federal spending. But there is a better plan. Let's get the money directly to working Americans.

Let's cancel the unauthorized and new programs and new spending in this bill and return it in the form of waived payroll taxes for working Americans. Give them a vacation from payroll taxes. It will be like a 10 percent pay raise.

We all know what they will do with it. They will do one of three things. They will either save it, which helps the banks recapitalize and creates mortgages and home sales; or they will

spend it, which creates a demand for goods and a demand for more jobs; or they will invest it, which means companies can expand their businesses and hire more employees.

All we have to do is exchange the unauthorized new government spending and transfer that money back to hard-working Americans who earn the money. A very simple concept that will have a direct stimulation to our economy. And it will happen this year. We will not be waiting until 2010 or 2011 or 2012 or 2013. It will happen this year.

So let's cancel those new unauthorized programs and give back the taxes to working Americans and get the economy rolling.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Well, the opponents of this bill say there is a dramatic set of conditions that are new, but they have too narrow a focus, and they are singing the same old song, and we just heard it.

There are crises of confidence in this country, and this bill addresses it. There's a crisis of confidence in jobs. This bill addresses the need for jobs and for those who lose them. Families are worried about the education of their kids, and they wonder whether the government will respond. This bill provides, I think, \$140 billion to make sure that the education of the kids in this country will continue.

Families are worried about whether health care will continue. This bill provides dramatic new provisions for health care for 8 million families, at least, in this country.

Vote for this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a member of this committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that we are in unprecedented economic times that call for unprecedented action. The bill we have under consideration is certainly unprecedented because of the size itself. \$825 billion. That is just for now, without the add-ons we expect over in the Senate.

This measure will have an unprecedented impact on the deficit by increasing it by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next few years. In turn, this dramatic rise will trigger large-scale borrowing from the future incomes of our children and our grandchildren.

These add-on deficits will cause the Nation's debt to soar to a level at which we will owe interest payments of more than \$750 billion per year by the year 2019, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Those numbers assume that the stimulus package actually works—and we don't know for certain that it will work.

I raise these points because with spending numbers this high, we need to get it right. While there are certainly some good qualities to this bill, there are also numerous elements thus far, including spendout rates noted by CBO, that raise questions about the stimulus impact of the bill. Currently, there are estimates on the job creation potential of the bill that show only about 10 percent of the funds creating jobs. If those estimates are accurate, the question arises as to where the other funds are going.

Some analyses show that the lion's share of the monies in this bill are destined for expansion of an assortment of government programs that have nothing to do with economic stimulus. Moreover, these programs are ones that are funded each year through the normal appropriations process, and will be funded again in 2010.

That tells me that we are using this bill to expand the funding scope of certain programs in order to make room for additional spending in the 2010 cycle. We are calling this extra spending "emergency" spending so we will not have to find a way to pay for it. Whether we call it emergency, or something else, the deficit effect is still the same, and our children will pay for it.

Many of these programs already have large, unexpended balances. For example, there's \$5 billion for public housing. Yet, we have close to \$7 billion in unexpended public housing balances.

Many of the proponents of this bill talk of the need to rebuild the Nation's highway and bridge infrastructure, and speak of the job creation potential of these activities. Yet, the highway portion of this bill contains less than 4 percent of the total funding.

I am very supportive of legitimate stimulus that results in net economic activity and job creation. For that reason, I offered an amendment in the full committee designed to ensure that all stimulus funds would produce net economic activity and not supplant existing funds. I also cosponsored an amendment with Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN that would have moved some \$60 billion to transportation, flood control, and environmental restoration projects.

Ladies and gentlemen, our children and grandchildren are going to pay for this debt.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 15 seconds. My friend from Iowa says that this bill is too big. I will make a deal with him. I will be happy to give him a smaller bill if he will show me a smaller problem.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Speaking of smaller problems, I might mention I had hoped that the chairman put that Jefferson Memorial problem in the 2009 bill, which is yet to be passed, through the whole process.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON.)

Mrs. EMERSON. Let me say how pleased I am to be the ranking member of the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee for the

111th Congress and look forward to working cooperatively with Chairman SERRANO.

Regarding the Financial Services section of the recovery bill we are debating today, I am disappointed that neither I nor the minority's committee staff were given an opportunity to consult with the majority members or staff before the bill was produced and unveiled on the Internet.

One percent. One percent sound like a small amount but in this bill even one-tenth of 1 percent is not trivial. Here's an example. This bill includes \$7.7 billion for the GSA to build and renovate new Federal buildings and ports of entry. It's nearly 1 percent of the bill. However, in fiscal year 2008, GSA received a total appropriation of only \$1.4 billion for construction and renovations.

Now, most of us know from personal experience that GSA construction projects in our districts are hardly ever completed on time, and never under budget. At its highest levels, this is an agency that needs a wake-up call and a good scrubbing behind the ears. What it does not need is 5½ years' worth of annual budget appropriations to spend in 120 days, a task it most certainly cannot accomplish with any semblance of efficiency.

GSA lacks the contracting, program management and building engineering expertise to go from \$1.4 billion in appropriations to \$7.7 billion in just 1 year. Giving GSA the keys to nearly 1 percent of the stimulus package will result in gross mismanagement and future funding liabilities.

Additionally, according to lists provided by GSA of the projects they list that can be awarded within 120 days, 36 percent, or \$2 billion, are in Washington, DC. In a bill for the economic health of our entire Nation, Washington is surely getting the lion's share.

I am also concerned with \$600 million in the bill for the purchase of vehicles for Federal agencies. The bill states that these are to be primarily alternative fuel and plug-in hybrid vehicles, technologies I greatly support. However, there's currently no U.S. production for plug-in vehicles, and they won't be here until after the deadline of this bill has passed.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield the gentlelady 30 additional seconds.

Mrs. EMERSON. Additionally, the lack of fueling stations for these vehicles could produce a fleet of cars and trucks in this country that could create new obstacles for Federal agencies. Even David Brooks of the New York Times noted that concerns such as this one "were cast aside with bland reassurances" in our committee markup of this bill.

Mr. Chair, this is neither what we should be doing with the taxpayers' money, nor how we should be doing it.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. One way this bill promotes economic recovery is by promoting educational opportunity. \$13½ billion of targeted tax relief to help young people and not so young people attend college. Today, one out of five graduating high school students does not qualify for this assistance. But, because we provided a refundable tax credit, we help them, just as the appropriations section of this bill helps with expanded Pell Grants and other direct aid.

For one of these, Brad Burnett at Austin Community College, he says, "Getting a college education means breaking a generations' long cycle of poverty within my family that lets me fulfill the American dream."

For the first time, we cover textbooks and instructional materials under this bill. As we provide this individual opportunity, we upgrade the skills of our workforce and help climb out of this economic recession. For students, this is a bill that provides hope we can believe in. And for every one of these students who uses the opportunities in this bill, it can provide a diploma that they can count on.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the ranking member for the time. Everyone on this floor agrees that something needs to be done in terms of stimulating this economy. We all know that we are in difficult times. I also agree with Speaker PELOSI that any stimulus plan needs to be timely, temporary, and targeted.

It is timely. We need to do something. We know we need to do it quickly. Targeted. This would be targeted if your weapon was a scatter gun, because everything but the kitchen sink has been thrown into this appropriation bill.

□ 1745

Temporary? It would take a stretch of the imagination to believe that this was temporary.

Today, President Obama came and spoke with us. He said that he didn't want programs started that had what he called "a long tail," and that meant that it contributed to the long-term deficit of this country and that they were going to have to cut in later years.

I will tell you that there is nothing as eternal on this earth as a temporary government program. We all know that. I give you one example, school construction. We are going to start a school construction program. It has never been authorized before, but we are going to start one here. Does anybody really believe that we will then end it after 3 or 4 or 5 years whenever this slowdown in our economy turns around? It will be going on forever. We all know that.

We have a number of programs that have never been debated; I can't remember the exact number, something like 32 new authorizations, that have

never been debated in committee. They may be appropriate, I don't know, but we have never debated them to see if they should be authorized and whether they can compete against other programs for the limited amount of money. Well, the unlimited amount of money we apparently have in this bill.

In other cases, the spend-out is 3 or 4 or 5 years down the road. And I would ask you, why are we appropriating money for a program that will spend out money in 4 or 5 years down the road when we all hope that this economy has turned around? But yet, we are appropriating money now for that spend-out. It just doesn't make sense.

Why don't we go through the regular appropriation process to do that? I will give you one example dealing with the National Mall that we have talked about here today.

The Tidal Basin work alone has had huge swings in cost estimates for the very complicated and extensive work. In late December, the Park Service told the subcommittee that the Mall work alone could cost \$600 million, and now that number is \$20 million. In late December, the Park Service Budget Office told the subcommittee staff that they could use only \$15 million to \$20 million for planning and design the next 2 years, which seemed honest and logical given the size of the plan. Now, they claim they can spend over \$200 million over the next 2 years.

Our problem is that these things should be going through the regular appropriation process, and they are not. And there is a reason that they are not: It is because every idea that anyone has ever had for spending that they think is appropriate has been thrown into this bill to avoid the PAYGO rules. We all know that is the case, and we need to redo this bill and target it.

Mr. RANGEL. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who will share his idea of a new America.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the green stimulus provisions in this bill will generate tens of thousands of jobs and result in billions of dollars in economic investment.

Solar tax provisions that I authored will allow State and local governments, like Sonoma County in my district, to help homeowners and businesses more easily finance the purchase of solar. We are also making other critical investments in solar by creating a grant program to incentivize businesses to invest in renewable technology today, instead of waiting until the economy improves. An additional \$4 billion in bonds for use in renewable energy projects will be available for State and local governments as well.

These are just a few of the green stimulus provisions. Not only will this bill create green jobs that our economy needs today, but it will also enhance the long-term security and sustainability of our economy by investing in a smart-energy future that helps free us from our dependency on foreign oil.

I encourage everyone to vote "aye" on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Let me say that a lot of people I hear say they want to oppose this package because you really can't spend your way out of a recession; and, therefore, if spending is the only answer, then why not spend twice as much and get out of the problem twice as fast? But those same people think that maybe you shouldn't do anything, and I think they are just as wrong, to stand here and do nothing in the midst of this tremendous economic crisis.

But I do think we have to put a test to anything we try to do. It was pointed out earlier, and I have heard a lot of discussion: If you are going to have a stimulus package, it ought to meet certain criteria. It ought to be focused, targeted, if you will; it ought to be timely in the sense that it ought to begin to act immediately; and it ought not to last forever. And it seems to me, when I look at those three criteria, this package fails on all three counts. It is not focused. It is not targeted. It seems to be a hodgepodge, just kind of quickly thrown together, 152 different appropriations. No strategic vision involved, no underlying theme, just a little bit of spending on everything you wanted to spend money on but were afraid to ask, until now. And it, I think clearly, in so many cases doesn't pretend to be timely. When you do research, when you do student special education, how does that quickly kickstart the economy? It fails that test. And, finally, if we badly design a package like this, it will continue on, and the \$1.2 trillion deficit becomes \$2 trillion.

So I think there is a better way, and I think the Republicans have put forward that; because if we go through with a poorly, badly designed stimulus package, we are going to end up, in the words of Tennessee Ernie Ford, his old song, when he said we will just end up "another day older and deeper in debt." So I think there is a better way.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Many of us in this body, including myself, have been speaking about the perfect storm developing in this economy before 9/11. The truth is, we should have taken this aggressive action years ago. Today, we have finally constructed legislation which directly invests in the good people of America.

Through middle-class tax cuts, direct aid to State and local governments, and reinvestment in renewable energy, Congress is taking an affirmative step to enable economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, just think of how municipalities will be able to take advantage of tax exempt bonds and tax credit

bonds, and I speak as a former mayor, in depressed areas throughout the United States to provide municipalities with the wherewithal to really, really move this economy and provide jobs to our American people.

To ensure our children can compete and succeed in the troubling economy, we will renovate and modernize 10,000 schools. Who said it didn't work back in the thirties? Who said it?

Through this bill we also make college affordable and provide a \$2,500 college tax credit to 4 million students, and triple the number of fellowships in science to help spur the next generation of innovation.

This legislation invests American tax dollars in real infrastructure projects that are ready to go. Specifically, this plan allocates money for the repairing and modernizing of thousands of miles of America's roadways and providing new mass transit options for millions of Americans.

I want to commend my colleagues for their leadership and commitment to taking an explicit and aggressive lead in the creation of a comprehensive economic recovery and reinvestment package.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take swift and decisive action to pass this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, with this measure the new administration seems bound and determined to continue the failed policy of the past administration. It proves what I like to call McClintock's Second Law of Political Physics, which is, the more we spend on our mistakes, the less willing we are to admit them.

This policy has failed every time and every place it has been tried for a simple reason: Government cannot inject a single dollar into the economy that it has not first taken out of the same economy.

If I take a dollar from Peter and give it to Paul, it is true that Paul now has an extra dollar to spend; and, when he spends it, that dollar is going to ripple through the economy. The gentleman is correct. But the gentleman forgets that Peter now has one less dollar to spend in that same economy. In short, it nets to zero. In fact, it nets to less than zero, because we are shifting enormous resources away from investments that would be based on economic calculations in favor of investments that are being made on political ones.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the chairman, and rise in strong support of this legislation because of the boost it will provide to our ailing economy and the priority investments it makes in our Nation. To struggling families and communities around the country, with the passage of this bill we can say help is on the way.

We have heard from economists from all sides of the political spectrum, and

they all agree inaction and doing nothing is not an option. We need to join together with our new President, President Obama, and act boldly and decisively, and that is what this legislation does, by directing \$825 billion in stimulus where it is needed most, ready-to-go projects to put people back to work, investing in clean energy and the infrastructure we need for the 21st century, and middle-class tax relief for struggling American families so they have a little more breathing room in their budgets.

I am especially pleased with the provisions relating to energy efficiency and renewable energy that we have worked on, on a bipartisan basis, loan guarantees for renewable energy projects that are sidelined because of the credit crunch, and new authority for homeowners to retrofit their homes.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have a question for my Democratic colleagues: How would \$50 million for the National Endowment of the Arts possibly stimulate our economy? It won't. And the thing is that this whole bill is actually a steamroller of socialism that is being forced down our throats, and the economy is going to choke to death on this steamroller of socialism that you all are bringing forward.

It is a nonstimulus bill. It is not going to stimulate the economy. It is going to create very few jobs, if any at all. For every dollar of tax relief, you all are going to spend \$4 to put new grass on the Washington Mall. It is insane. It is absolutely insane the things that are in this bill.

I am going to vote "no," and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no," and I encourage the American people to stand up and say we are not going to tolerate this kind of stuff going on in this country.

We have got to slow down. We have got to look at alternatives that really will stimulate the economy, that is by reducing taxes and leaving dollars in the hands of the American public.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a hardworking member of the committee.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I grew up in my congressional district of Las Vegas. By any standard of measure, it has been a boomtown; record increases in population, almost no unemployment, record home ownership.

What a difference an economic meltdown can make. Nevada's economy, fueled by construction and tourism, has suffered beyond all imagination in this financial crisis. Las Vegas has the highest mortgage foreclosure rate in

the Nation, drastic drops in home values, and thousands of construction workers are without work. Casino workers, the backbone of our economy, laid off. The number of visitors flying to Las Vegas dropped 8 percent this past year, the largest drop in 25 years. My State needs help, and we need it now.

This bill will create or save millions of jobs over the next 2 years. In my district, thousands of construction workers will be put back to work improving roads and highways, building renewable energy facilities, improving aging school buildings and other infrastructure. The bill will also provide for extended unemployment benefits for the over 9 percent of my workforce out of work.

The bill will also provide extended unemployment benefits for the 9 percent of the workforce out of work and provide needed money for medicaid to provide health care to the neediest among us.

Ninety-five percent of our fellow citizens will get a tax cut.

Nevada and our country need the jobs and other support provided by this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is a sad day for the United States Congress. People are hurting throughout this entire economy. And instead of bringing a bill that would stimulate our economy, what we see before us is a bill that will simply stimulate big government.

You know, most Americans, Mr. Chairman, believe that the reason that we are in the problem economy that we have is because as a Nation we borrowed and spent too much. And, instead, we have a bill theoretically to solve our problem that borrows and spends too much. You cannot borrow and spend your way into prosperity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we were all Keynesians, and I assure you I am not, but if we were, all government spending is not created equal. The Keynesians would tell you. You look at this bill, 4 percent of this is spent on what most economists would call infrastructure, our roads and bridges.

We need tax relief for small businesses. We need tax relief for American families. And we need to do it in a way that doesn't send the bill to future generations. The tax relief for small businesses is as miniscule, less than 2 percent.

□ 1800

Instead, what we have is over half of this bill is to inflate big government. We have \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$726 million for an after-school snack program, office furniture for the Public Health Service, \$1 billion for the Census.

Mr. Chairman, the list goes on and on and on. And what we have is a bill that when you add the debt service is \$1.2 trillion.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a new member of the committee, but a seasoned legislator.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I do so because it appears to me that it's actually tailor-made for my district and tailor-made for areas throughout the country. Most impressive about it for me is the fact that it provides the assistance to those at the very bottom of the socioeconomic scale, dislocated workers, individuals who have lost their jobs and individuals who are unemployed, money to assist States with their Medicaid deals, individuals who without it wouldn't know where to turn, wouldn't know what to do. It's interesting to hear about great giveaways. But do you know that what is a giveaway for some is a need for others?

There has never been more need for this legislation than right now. I commend Chairman RANGEL and all of the other chairpersons who have worked on it. It's a great piece of legislation. I will proudly vote for it.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 64½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I will be yielding time, Mr. Chairman, to others, so I will reserve my time for now.

Mr. RANGEL. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. NYE), and commend him for his hard work to expand the work opportunity to encourage business to hire our beloved veterans.

Mr. NYE. I thank the chairman for his leadership and for giving me the opportunity to work with him to make sure that our veterans and our small businesses are included in this economic recovery package.

Mr. Chairman, helping businesses hire veterans makes good economic sense. That is why I strongly support the provision of this bill that would give substantial tax credits to businesses that hire unemployed veterans.

This proposal will reduce taxes for small businesses. It will bring more highly-trained workers into the workforce. And perhaps most importantly, it will help us keep faith with the men and women who have served our country in uniform.

In my home district, the Second District of Virginia, we're home to the largest population of military personnel and veterans in the country. And as the people of Hampton Roads can tell you, an investment in our veterans and small businesses is a responsible investment in our economy and a wise investment for our future.

I thank Chairman RANGEL for his leadership. I know he shares my commitment to standing up for all of our veterans, and I look forward to working with him on this issue as we continue to rebuild our economy.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in order to ask a question, let me yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman. I listened to the gentleman from Virginia carefully, and I'm curious. I would be happy to yield time to him.

When he talks about provisions that make economic sense, could he explain how \$50 million to the National Endowment for the Arts makes economic sense for his congressional district? I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to respond to that if the gentleman wants to yield to me.

Mr. HENSARLING. The gentleman from Virginia was the one who spoke. So I'm happy to yield time to him. I see the gentleman is not interested in answering the question.

Mr. OBEY. I will be happy to respond to the gentleman if he wants, since I am responsible for the money in the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I appreciate the offer of the chairman. But I have plenty of opportunities to speak with him.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, this could be one of the roughest times our great Nation has faced economically, but I think that history is going to recall this as one of the proudest moments that our Congress would be involved in. No, we're not taking care of banks or fiscal institutions or those who buy the jets. But we are taking care of our middle class. That is the heart of America. That is what pumps our economy. And that is why we're trying to help them by expanding their disposable income, helping the working families with kids, helping our veterans who are unemployed, bringing some relief to those who feel the pain yet are looking toward the future for new economies to make this a greener America, getting involved in high tech and helping people out with health.

In the final analysis, besides the flag, what makes us so great is that this country is going to be healthy, educated and competitive. And at the end of the day, it will be recalled that, yes, we got hit hard economically, but the strong middle class and this United States House of Representatives came forward, and we saved our country and we saved our economy.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard the proverb that if you give a man a fish, he can eat for a day. If you teach him to fish, he can eat for a lifetime. This bill is full of fish going to deserving people to eat for 1 day. There is nothing in here for fishing rods. There is nothing in here for training.

To get out of the slump, we need to get people who are unemployed employed in real jobs with real companies. We have the second highest tax on corporations in the world. Lowering that tax burden would help get people hired. To hire people, most of whom will be hired by small businesses, the owner of that business needs a predictable future. This gives him none of that.

The other side is very proud to say that 95 percent are going to get a tax cut. But that tax cut means a refundable tax credit for people who do not pay taxes. Today, 15 million people get their income tax rebated plus a payroll tax plus more from the taxpayer.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is now controlling 15 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Members of Congress and those who are watching our deliberations today, this is an important bill. We have 7 percent of the country unemployed, and that number is going up. So in this legislation, we are trying to put funds to help people get jobs and move our economy to a stronger position.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has three important areas where we have made a contribution to this legislation. We have investments in building out a new broadband infrastructure. This will allow rural and other underserved areas to join the global economy. This legislation also provides \$27 billion to accelerate deployment of smart grid technology, fund energy efficiency investments and establish a new loan guarantee program for renewable energy. These will provide new jobs. They will reduce our dependence on foreign oil. And they will protect our environment.

This bill contains important health provisions. The bill will help those people who lose their jobs by providing temporary health insurance. We do this in two ways. The COBRA program, which allows people to keep their insurance from their former employer, will be subsidized for those who want to hold on to that private insurance. It will also have a component to provide funds under the Medicaid program to cover the unemployed Americans who do not have COBRA coverage. Secondly, the bill would accelerate the nationwide adoption of health information technology. This investment will create high tech jobs, reduce medical errors and improve care. And thirdly, the bill will provide a temporary boost for State Medicaid programs facing surges in caseloads at the same time that the State has fewer resources in revenues. This is called the FMAP, the Federal Medicaid Assistance Program, and it would provide additional funds for States with particularly high unemployment.

In this bill, when it was reported out of committee, we had a sensible provision to allow low-income women better access to family planning services, one

of the most important preventive health services we can provide. It also would allow women to stay in the workforce. Unfortunately, this provision has generated a firestorm of misinformation and unfounded criticism from the Republican members. I have spoken to President Obama about this provision. He strongly supports this cost-saving policy. He is committed, as I am, to seeing this provision become law. But we don't want this provision to become a distraction from the other legislation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself an additional 20 seconds.

So in order to keep the spotlight focused on the important task at hand, this provision will be removed from the bill. We will get it into the law in some other legislation later in the year.

We in this bill have an important down payment on programs that lead us in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I proudly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my good buddy for yielding.

Margaret Thatcher, the former Prime Minister of England, said that the problem with socialism is you eventually run out of somebody else's money. And what I'm concerned about here is not just the money we're spending today. We have spent \$700 billion on the Wall Street bailout, and we don't know where most of that money has gone. Now we're going to put another \$835 billion into this so-called economic stimulus bill.

President Obama said on January 16 that this plan is a significant down payment on our most urgent challenges. Vice President BIDEN said last Sunday that Timothy Geithner, the Treasury Secretary, will soon recommend to President Obama whether more money is needed beyond the \$700 billion allocated to American banks. Lawrence Summers, the top economic adviser to the President, said that the government can't afford to spend more than \$1 trillion to boost the economy and save financial institutions.

My question is, where does it end? We're printing so much money and we're going to spend so much money that we're going to put this whole country and our future generations into a deep hole which will lead us, in my opinion, to government control and socialism.

The thing that has made this country great is the free enterprise system and private enterprise and private individuals making a profit, creating jobs and making the economy flourish. What we're doing is we're turning this whole economy over to the government with more and more and more spending. And what we're doing today is just the beginning. We're talking about \$2 trillion, \$3 trillion, \$4 trillion more down

the road, and we can't afford it. We can't afford the inflation, and we certainly can't afford socialism and more government control.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE), a new member of our committee who has played a very constructive and important role in the development of this bill.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and I would like to thank Chairman WAXMAN and the leadership for including funds in this bill for improved access to rural broadband. Put differently, it recognizes the importance of access to high-speed Internet technology for all communities, regardless of affluence or location.

This bill will help bridge the divide between rural America and urban and suburban America when it comes to access not only to technology, but what technology brings; better educational opportunities, better health-care related opportunities and certainly better economic development opportunities.

What we're saying in this bill is something that I have known for a long time. High speed Internet access is not a luxury. It is a necessity. And what we're saying with this bill today and with the allocation of these funds for rural broadband is that our rural communities will no longer be left behind and no longer be relegated to the sidelines of advancing technology.

Today is not a small step. It is a massive leap that will bring hundreds of thousands of Americans in Appalachian Ohio and in other underserved areas into the new century.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

□ 1815

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I do not want to see any family face unemployment or foreclosure, or any business experience a downturn, but I fear we are suffering from a tyranny of worn-out ideas here.

This bill is called a stimulus bill, but I believe it is an unsustainable spending bill.

Mr. Chairman, when did we decide that more Federal spending in itself is economic stimulus? Since 2000, we have increased spending by about 60 percent in this country and the national debt has nearly doubled. Despite these growing expenditures, our economy has worsened, and we are left with an \$11 trillion debt. And now we have a proposal that is before us that would be the largest spending bill in the United States history, and no plan to pay for it.

Will we continue to rely on foreign nations, such as China, already bankrolling our spending habits? Or just defer responsibility to our children

and our grandchildren and future generations? We are delaying tough choices and we are pushing reality down the road here. Much of this assistance goes to subsidizing States. Some States, like Nebraska, have thus far managed their budgets responsibly, even in tough times. I won't ask Nebraskans to pay for poor governance elsewhere.

Mr. Chair, I don't want to give a speech simply to oppose. There are some important, new bold ideas here, such as alternative energy for a sustainable energy future, a modern electrical grid and health information technology. But the entirety of the package puts us on a path of aggressive spending, in the name of stimulus, that will be nearly impossible to reverse.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the balance of our time be managed by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ALTMIRE). Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Last year, 2.6 million jobs were lost, and on Monday alone four American companies announced that they were laying off 37,000 employees. When workers lose their jobs, many also lose their health insurance. And for those lucky enough to keep their coverage, many end up delaying medical care because they choose to use their limited resources on groceries and other basic necessities. These families need help, and they will get it from this economic recovery package.

This bill makes important improvements to COBRA coverage so it is more affordable for workers who have been laid off. In addition, for those workers who have lost their job but are not eligible for COBRA coverage, the bill creates a new temporary Medicaid option that will be paid for entirely by the Federal Government. Combined, these provisions will help provide health coverage to over 8 million Americans over the next year.

In addition, this bill will provide States with urgent fiscal relief. Right now, almost every State is experiencing a budget crisis. Governors are struggling to find ways to close these budget gaps, and many governors are starting to look at scaling back on their Medicaid programs, just as more and more people are in need of Medicaid services.

This bill provides critical financial assistance so States are not forced to scale back their Medicaid programs and can continue to serve those in need.

We also make a significant investment in our economic future by investing \$20 billion to help doctors and hospitals acquire and use health information technology. For years we have all been talking about the need to modernize our health care system, and this bill finally provides the means to do so.

Not only does this legislation invest in our economy today, but it also makes our health care system safer and more efficient for years to come.

The recovery package answers the pleas from economists who said that we must act quickly and boldly, and it certainly deserves bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time, and I do rise, unfortunately, in opposition to H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the so-called stimulus package.

Mr. Chairman, we spent 12 hours in the Energy and Commerce Committee marking our portion of this bill up last week, and a few, a very few Republican amendments were approved and summarily stripped out as we see this new bill before us today.

But it is not really process that is my objection, it is just that I have a great fear that instead of throwing water on a fire, as it has been described, this economic problem that we have, we are about to throw kerosene on the fire and make the matter a lot worse. We tried to explain that to President Obama when he visited our conference today, and we want him to show some changes in the bill that we Republicans can accept, like more tax breaks for small businesses and entrepreneurs who create jobs.

I regretfully oppose the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, we are not launching just a stimulus package here, we are launching a new, clean energy rocket. We know how to launch revolutions in technology. We did it in the original Apollo project that started right in this Chamber when John F. Kennedy launched that project standing right behind me. In this bill today, we are launching a similarly ambitious and similarly important clean energy revolution.

The reason I say that is the next few years, when hundreds of people go to work building lithium-ion batteries for our advanced electric cars, like at the A123 Battery Company in Massachusetts, it is because of this bill. When hundreds of people go to work doing advanced photovoltaic panels, like at Nanosolar, a thin-film photovoltaic company in California, it is going to be because of this bill. When hundreds of people go to work making gasoline out of algae, like they are doing in the deserts of Nevada, it is because of this bill. We are launching a rocket, a revolution, today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, the significance of what we face can only be described as a generational challenge. Many of my colleagues seem to believe that the only solution is to spend enormous amounts of taxpayer money.

First we are told that we had to spend \$700 billion to bail out Wall Street. Then we were told that, despite the bailout's failure, we needed another \$350 billion. And now this Congress is told to approve nearly \$1 trillion in a taxpayer-funded giveaway.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is time to remind my colleagues that this Nation is already facing unsustainable levels of government spending. Responsible action today is not to spend more, but to reform the way we do business and spend less. The current economic crisis should serve as a warning, a powerful warning to this Congress: face your economic demons, or be crushed by your political cowardice.

For years we have lived on borrowed time. We have continued to throw money at unsustainable and broken programs like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. These programs must be fixed.

On a more blunt point, our Nation's energy policy is an absolute travesty. To put it simply, our policies are bizarre. We want abundant energy, but we enact policies that do nothing but march us in the opposite direction.

It is time for this Congress to face reality. We should permit more oil development off Alaska and our coastlines. I know this is shocking to hear, but we must also match the leadership of France and produce 80 percent of our electricity from nuclear reactors.

The bottom line is we need jobs. Energy development will create jobs. I can assure you that throwing more and more money at the problem isn't going to solve the crisis. Simply taking action to be seen as doing something is denying reality and is an injustice to the American people.

Tough choices need to be made. While they will not always be popular, nor will they be easy, they are most certainly necessary.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Environment and Energy Subcommittee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

This urgently-needed stimulus bill funds infrastructure projects that are shovel-ready, while also supporting future-oriented projects that are circuit-ready: broadband, electronic medical records, smart grid, advanced battery technologies, and other vital priorities.

This package is a major downpayment on the clean, renewable energy future this country has been waiting for and desperately needs.

But this legislation should not be characterized by what we spend, but

rather by what we save. These smart, clean energy investments will save jobs, ensuring that windmills and solar panels are built here at home. It will save energy through efficiency measures on schools and buildings, and it will save consumers and businesses money on their heating, gas and energy bills.

With the support included in this package, wind capacity will grow from 25,000 megawatts today to 44,000 megawatts generated on a daily basis in 2012. At 220 tons of steel per wind turbine, that is nearly 3 million tons of new steel demands. Those steel jobs are blue collar jobs tinted green by the force of the clean energy revolution.

The massive investments in weatherization, State energy efficiency grants, and Federal building efficiency are some of the safest and smartest investments our country can make right now. They put money into the pockets of American workers and pay for themselves in the form of energy savings and lower energy prices.

This energy efficiency double dividend is a proven, reliable phenomenon that our current weak economy must exploit. Working smarter, not harder, that is what this bill is all about.

The bill provides \$20 billion in new health IT infrastructure to improve care, lower costs and reduce medical efforts. I am pleased that the bill includes patient privacy safeguards that I have long advocated, including a provision that I offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee markup to ensure that patients' medical records are made unreadable to unauthorized individuals. This was supported by Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Member BARTON. This is an issue that we all agree on, the privacy and security of our medical records.

Today we have before us a balanced, well-thought out package that provides tax relief for 95 percent of Americans and targets investments in key areas to turn around the American economy. I strongly support these measures and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Indiana, Mr. BUYER.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, in December as then President-elect Obama was putting together his transition team, I turned to the staff on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on the Republican side and said I do appreciate Mr. Obama's tone for bipartisanship, and I instructed the staff to look at all of the construction projects and work with the Bush administration. We sent a letter then to not only Speaker PELOSI but also President-elect Obama. We asked for two things, in essence. What I sought to do was complement then President-elect Obama with regard to the extension of his hand in bipartisanship.

My letter asked to include veterans in the stimulus plan, and to do two

things. Since my Democrat colleagues love to do public works, we would do that for them. We would do public works, and we will also do job creation and entrepreneurship to satisfy Republicans. We would be bipartisan in regard to our letter to the transition team and to the Speaker of the House.

Well, what do you think happened? My gesture was half met. So as the ranking Republican on Veterans' Affairs, I asked for a billion dollars with regard to \$950 million for hospital non-recurring maintenance, i.e. construction, and then \$500 million for cemeteries, recurring maintenance, and then a billion dollars for small business loan guarantees.

Oh, we are not going to take creation of jobs and entrepreneurship. That was rejected. What they took were the public works side. Let's create jobs. Well, excuse me, strike that. We are going to create work. See, there is a difference between creation of work and creation of a job.

So what I am hopeful is here, I have gone to the Rules Committee and I have offered four amendments to the Rules Committee, and I am hopeful that they will adopt this. Entrepreneurship is important.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chair, the balance of my remarks I submit for the RECORD.

Mr. Chair, today, the headline in the State's largest newspaper noted an additional 50,000 job losses across the country. Indiana's unemployment rate jumped a full 1% last month to 8.2%. Hoosiers are worried about their economic future, wondering if they can afford to send their kids to college or afford retirement.

The stimulus bill being rammed through Congress is not the medicine to meet the economic challenges we face in the short term or the long term. Business owners, workers and employers tell me they believe we need a short term stimulus to get the economy moving again, real tools to help them stay solvent.

However, the bill before us is a political tool geared more toward 2012 than 2009. Very little of this stimulus bill will do anything to grow the economy or expand our job base. Not to mention the cost on future generations. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the federal deficit will rise to a record \$1.2 trillion in 2009, and that does not even include the near \$1 trillion included in this massive spending bill.

Most of the discretionary spending in this bill will not actually be spent until after 2010—only 8% of the spending will take place this year.

This legislation alone increases the national debt by \$6,700 for every American household. It does out enough money to give every man, woman and child in the nation \$2,700 each. How can I explain that as responsible and rational government spending to the Hoosiers that I represent back home in Indiana?

This is only the first shot. Watch out America. The increased debt caused by this legislation will be used as a further rationale for raising taxes and continued government spending in the future.

The Federal Government cannot spend its way out of this recession. History tells us that to expand the economy the private sector must grow. We need to pass policies that promote growth and economic expansion, not policies that give handouts. Instead of a handout, we must give Americans a hand through short-term stimulus and long-term tax policies which will allow the real job makers—the private sector—to grow our economy.

This legislation is not the appropriate means to revitalize the economy. Instead of creating higher taxes for American families by increasing government spending, we should make permanent the 2001 and 2003 tax reductions and reduce individual, small business and corporate taxes. Extending these tax cuts and further reducing taxes would stimulate long-term job production and increase the gross domestic product, thereby improving our economy and shortening the length of the recession. This bill creates a lot of work, not the desperately needed jobs that help bolster the long term growth of this Nation's economy.

□ 1830

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank you for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan and to give you just 10 of the many good reasons to support this particular bill.

One, it will save and create three to four million jobs;

Two, it provides a critical boost in Medicaid assistance to States so that budget shortfalls don't harm access to health care;

Three, it will help those who lose their jobs maintain health insurance;

Four, it invests in renewable energy technologies and research;

Five, it provides a 100 percent increase in weatherization funding to help make homes and businesses energy efficient;

Six, it extends unemployment insurance coverage through the end of the year and increases the benefit by \$25 a week;

Seven, it increases the maximum Pell Grant to help more people go to college;

Eight, it helps rebuild our schools and gives them financial support;

Nine, it increases funding for affordable housing and homelessness prevention programs;

Ten, it will give a tax credit to 95 percent of American workers, a credit worth up to \$1,000.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman.

This debate is really about two dollars. This is the dollar that's in the hands of the American people tonight, and this is the dollar, what it looks like when we give it to the Federal Government. You know, it shrinks because we don't spend it wisely.

Tonight we're being asked to consider a bill for \$825 billion. And you know what? We don't have \$825 billion. You know what we're going to have to do? We're going to have to print these. And guess what? In order to issue them, we're going to have to borrow the money from countries like China.

The question is, are we going to try and spend and borrow our way out of this economic downturn? The American people know that's not the answer. They also know that it's better for them to invest this dollar in the American economy than let the Federal Government go spend this dollar in our economy.

Mr. Chair, I'm disappointed that we are considering a bill tonight that's almost equal to the entire discretionary budget that would normally go through the appropriation process. Oh, no, we didn't go through any process, we were brought a bill and said this is what we should do.

The American people want us to leave this dollar in their pocket.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, today this House will vote on the largest economic recovery package in this Nation's history. After weeks of discussion and debate, we have come to a compromise bill that incorporates different points of view and makes the necessary hard choices.

Funding in this bill rebuilds crumbling roads and bridges, locks and dams, it improves security on our borders and our ports, it repairs and maintains our VA and DOD health facilities, modernizes our schools, laboratories and classrooms. But, most important, this economic recovery package will put people back to work and put money back in their pockets with a tax cut for 95 percent of working families in America. It will create jobs, get the economy moving again, and leave this country with items of lasting significance to show for it.

Mr. Chairman, we simply cannot wait any longer to help our economy and get this country moving again. Passage of this bill is a necessary step in that direction.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to the amount of time that's remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 53½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to H. Res. 88, I yield the balance of my time to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan will control the balance of the time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the House Budget Committee and member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better than this. We're losing tens of thousands of jobs a week in this economy. This is the worst recession we've seen in generations. And what are we about to vote on? We are about to vote on a trillion dollar spending package—yes, a trillion dollars, because the Congressional Budget Office just told us today just to pay for the interest on this bill is another \$350 billion. We're going to vote on a trillion dollar spending package that amounts to basically a spending wish list for all the special interest groups out there. In fact, for those who are into all of this spending, half of the spending doesn't even occur for 2 more years. But the spending that occurs quickly are things like \$15 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, \$6 billion for arts and culture, \$600 million to buy new cars for Federal employees. Is this the way toward prosperity? Toward jobs?

I want you to take a look at the tax policy in this bill. The big idea is let's give everybody a rebate that's 10 bucks a week per individual or a whopping \$20 a week for couples. Do you really think that's going to turn this economy around?

2.7 percent of this bill is aimed at encouraging businesses to retain and create jobs; 2.7 percent of this entire \$1 trillion bill to help businesses create jobs. I think we need a little more than that. We need to help the small businesses, the self-employed, the entrepreneurs get out there and create jobs. We had a major manufacturer in the Midwest just announce 20,000 layoffs yesterday. There is hardly anything in this bill that will do anything to help those manufacturers get those jobs back.

What's worse is that after we go on this spending binge, this will lead to higher taxes. The Congressional Budget Office is saying we're going to have the highest unemployment we've seen in 25 years for the next 4 years. And what this bill will do is it will lead us to higher taxes; higher taxes on small businesses, higher taxes on capital, higher taxes on investment, on our savings portfolios, on our retirement, on our college savings plans. That's what is in store right around the corner at the end of next year.

My fear is this: we need to come together with an economic rescue package that actually helps the economy. This bill is not worthy of our new President's signature. We can do better than this. This is not something that should come to the floor. I understand the majority can do as they please. They can shut the minority out—and that's fine, they did that, and that is their choice and their prerogative—but what really matters is whether this creates jobs, and it doesn't.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me just take up where my

good friend from the other side left off. I take great umbrage with what he has said.

This is a very good measure that is timed for this extraordinary time that we're in now. We are in the worst economic crisis in the history of this country, many say since the Depression. But from what I understand, at the rate of losing 6,000 homes to foreclosures every day, we're losing 7,200 jobs every day since the beginning of this year, there has been nothing like that in the history of this country. The American people are expecting us to act and move with boldness, with confidence, not whining, not saying, oh, woe is me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that these are, indeed, the times that try men's souls. In the history of this country we've had those moments. When the history is written on this moment, what do we want them to say about what the Congress did when we faced the greatest economic crisis of our time? Do we want to say we whined and said no and did nothing? Or do they want to see where we did the practical thing of stimulating the economy by investing in its infrastructure, in its schools, in its health care, that not only creates jobs, but creates wealth and gets our economy well?

And, yes, we understand there's another way to stimulate the economy through selective tax cuts, but Mr. Chairman, those tax cuts needed to be targeted down at the level of the people at the lower incomes and the middle incomes that are going to be most likely to spend the money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we've taken care of the banks; let's take care of the American people and pass this measure.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill with the firm belief and hope that we can do better.

We are currently undergoing a severe economic downturn. My own State and district have been badly impacted. And I share our new President's desire to move quickly on an economic recovery measure. However, I cannot support a bill that claims to provide \$275 billion in tax relief when \$80 billion of that is going to people with no income tax liability. You can't cut taxes for someone who doesn't pay taxes. Mr. Chairman, we can do better by focusing on tax relief that creates incentives for economic activity.

Nor can I support a bill that spends hundreds of billions on big government programs like the National Endowment for the Arts or new cars for Federal workers. We do need to make long-term investments in infrastructure and health information technology, but long-term investments require careful planning. We can do better by taking

the time to get infrastructure and health IT right, and by eliminating wasteful spending.

Nor can I support a bill that would lead employers to cut jobs or drop health coverage in the middle of a recession. Allowing workers to stay on COBRA longer—more than 30 years in some cases—could impose an unfunded mandate on employers of \$40 billion or more. In the Ways and Means Committee, the majority refused even to study the effect of this provision on coverage. We can do better by expanding eligibility for health insurance tax relief, and by providing more funding for high-risk pools for those who can't get coverage elsewhere.

Finally, I can't support an \$825 billion bill that won't fully take effect until 18 months or 2 years down the road, or even longer. Mr. Chairman, people in my district need help today. We can do better by passing fast-acting tax relief that will create jobs this year, plus extended unemployment benefits for those out of work.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." Mr. Chairman, we can and must do better.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I would yield that remaining time to Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I know that our new President is sincere in trying to get the economy moving. Unfortunately, I think the only winners in this bill are the special interests who are swarming the Capitol looking for their piece of the pie. And the losers will be the American taxpayers, who ultimately are going to see their taxes increased to pay for all this spending. There's a right way to spur the economy. This isn't it. And again, it will lead to higher tax increases.

Proponents claim that this will help spur demand for families, but the average worker will only take home an extra \$1.35 a day. I can't imagine them rushing to the mall with that small of a windfall. This is supposed to help small businesses create jobs, but in truth, there's more money allocated to buy new art in America than there is to help small businesses expense new equipment and computers.

This is designed to create jobs, but each job would cost \$225,000 to create a smaller \$50,000 job. This is supposed to be about infrastructure, but only about a tiny part, 3½ percent, will go to new roads. And school construction is just a tiny part of a massive education bill. And what's frustrating is there is no free money, there is no free money in Washington; someone sometime is going to have to pay for this. And at a time when we are seeing record debt, the highest debt in peacetime since 1930, it is the American public who ultimately will have to pay this bill.

To put it in perspective so that every taxpayer understands, the cost of this measure is equal to doubling all the income taxes every American pays for 1 year; not just the wealthy, not just the middle class, every taxpayer would have to double their taxes in order to pay for this spending spree.

Mr. President, I would urge you to veto this bill. It is not targeted or timely. It is not an era of new responsibility. This is a tax increase, a stimulus that will fail, unfortunately, and we have a better idea.

□ 1845

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage Chairman MILLER in a colloquy for purposes of illuminating the intent of the job training and worker diversification provisions of H.R. 1, the Economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Earlier in the month, I, along with 12 of my colleagues, sent a letter to then President-elect Obama seeking to promote gender equity in the infrastructure job creation spurred by the economic recovery funding. With women holding less than 10 percent of construction jobs, the letter asked for additional funding for the Department of Labor program known as WANTO, which trains women for higher-wage nontraditional jobs, and to strengthen the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs so it can effectively enforce current laws that require contractors to reach out and recruit women into jobs in which they're underrepresented.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman would yield, I want to say to the gentleman I share your concern that women receive equal opportunity to be trained and hired in the types of higher-paid positions that are traditionally occupied by men. The bill provides approximately \$4 billion to train workers who need new or additional skills. Job training to train women in nontraditional job retains its priority recognition as under current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

The bill also provides \$80 million to enhance worker protections on those jobs including through the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, Health and Safety, and wage and hour enforcement.

Mr. POLIS of Colorado. I thank the chairman for his explanation. I appreciate the consideration that this Chamber has given to improving the protections and opportunities afforded to women seeking to take care of their families in this very challenging economic time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes at this time to the distinguished gentleman of the Ways and Means Committee from Washington State (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, just last week the Joint Committee on Taxation could not say whether any jobs would be created by the nearly \$1 trillion package before us.

We cannot let calls for swift action overrun common sense, thorough consideration, and healthy debate. The bailout showed us the mistakes that can happen when government rushes to action.

We are united, however, Democrats and Republicans, together in recognizing the need for action. This is a time for smart, accountable, and targeted investments to get our economy back on track, not more of the same shotgun spending that mortgages our children's futures.

There are clearly provisions in this bill that I support and I think every Member in the House has something in this bill they support. But we are here to pass an emergency stimulus package that creates jobs, not another spending bill.

To stimulate the economy and preserve, promote, and create jobs, we must enact proven measures like broad-based tax relief for families and small businesses, opening new markets to trade, and investing wisely in infrastructure. Those are the things that will get our economy moving and create jobs for people in our Nation.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure so that we can work together with President Obama, who has reached out to the Republican side and encouraged us to provide our input, our ideas, and our thoughts to craft effective legislation that gets our economy back on track.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Our economy is falling apart. We have millions of people out of work. We have millions of people who are out of work that don't even have unemployment benefits anymore. We have got to respond to the immediate needs of the American people.

I don't agree with everything in this legislation, but I know one thing: If we don't move quickly to try to take steps to stimulate this economy, we are only going to go down faster. I see this legislation as being an appropriate first step that will help bring needed money and put it in the hands of the American people.

We're going to have to do more, though. I have bills to create a universal pre-kindergarten program that will help American families relieve a lot of financial burden; a bill with JOHN CONYERS to create a not-for-profit health care system, universal health care, that will solve a major problem for business and industry and give all Americans health care.

Congress must make a beginning. That's what we were elected to do. We need to work together, Democrats and Republicans, and put aside our differences on some of the issues that are in this package in order to look for the higher good of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KUCINICH. So I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we see things in this package we don't like. We don't like the fact that some of the benefits aren't getting to people quickly enough. I am concerned about that as well. But the fact of the matter is we have to realize this is our first step, and that first step has to be in the direction of relieving the economic crisis for the American family.

I stood with Members on the other side of the aisle in challenging the bailout. But it's time that we start to give benefits to the American people, and this legislation does that. I urge its support.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. Boustany.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, both sides can agree that our national economy is in trouble as tens of thousands of Americans are without work. But the question remains, are we going to get this right? The bill before us falls far short of the goals that we are hoping to achieve.

In 2005 my home State of Louisiana saw economic devastation as the result of two hurricanes. During that recovery effort, we learned many things about what government can and can't do effectively and quickly. Tax relief for small businesses and families enable businesses across the Gulf Coast to rebuild, expand, and create good-paying, long-lasting jobs. As a result, thousands of Louisiana families found security they desperately needed following these two storms.

Government direct spending was also attempted. However, 3 years later, 3 years later, much of that money is still tied up in bureaucratic entanglement.

There's a lesson here. There is clearly a lesson. There are many different solutions to a problem, and this economic crisis, as complex as it is, certainly proves this. But secondly and more importantly, we must look for solutions that will produce results.

We need to spur job creation to get Americans working again, and the best way to achieve that job creation is by reducing taxes on small businesses, entrepreneurs, and companies who can put people to work now.

We are willing to work with the administration and with our friends across the aisle to accomplish these goals. Together I believe we could craft a bill that would stimulate private sector job growth, which is what's des-

perately needed. That will make this country competitive again. This bill will not accomplish those goals.

I would urge a "no" vote on this bill, and let's come up with a better way to do this.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I must say that I truly admire the courage of my friends on the other side of the aisle. In the middle of the worst economic downturn that any of us can remember, our parents told us about the Depression, an unprecedented and accelerating job loss all across the American economy in every sector, our friends on the other side of the aisle ask us just for one last time to do what they've been doing the last 8 years; to just one more time give the tax cuts to the richest people in the country; to just one more time dive into the tank of fiscal irresponsibility.

They inherited a \$5 trillion surplus, and they squandered it to an \$8 trillion deficit. They created the slowest job creation since World War II, the slowest job creation since World War II in a recovery. They held middle income wages stagnate. In fact, many families lost ground. The wealthy did the best.

They stood by while banks created liar loans, while banks created no-doc loans, while people on Wall Street played fast and easy with hardworking Americans' money in their pension plans. And what do we get for their 8 years? We see people now getting their returns on their pensions, their 401(k) plans, and 30, 40, 50 percent of their assets are gone and those who are over 55 living in panic about how will they have a retirement. And yet they stand here day after day and say just let us have more of what we were doing in the past.

You know, when that helicopter took off outside here in this plaza, millions of Americans gave that President a wave good-bye because in the middle of this historic downturn, millions and millions of Americans made a decision to go in another direction because what you were doing hadn't worked for them or for their families, hadn't worked for them or their families, because that was your policy.

Mr. Chairman, that was their policy, crude and rude with respect to working Americans in this country and their families.

So what do we have now? We have an incredible consensus of economists who are on the left, who are on the right, who advised Republican candidates in the past, Ronald Reagan, JOHN MCCAIN, and they have said you have got to put together a recovery act where the government spends this money on projects to put people back to work to create jobs. It will not stop unemployment, but it will help. It will help. And that's what we're doing here. That's what we're doing here.

They also said from the right and the left, as they told us that the American

economy is shutting down while you're asking to do more of the same, they said don't forget education. We cannot have young people lose a year or 2 years of education because of an economic downturn. You must support education at the local level. Why? Because the States and local governments are hemorrhaging, hemorrhaging the loss of revenues. Because people can't afford to buy a car, they're not buying a car. Because home price values are dropping so fast that they're going in and getting their property taxes reestablished because of the loss of value in homes, and that's costing local governments and school districts money from sales tax and property tax. So we're trying to make sure that those students don't lose that educational opportunity.

We see a number of students are now starting to forego college who are in the middle of their college education because of costs. Yes, we're going to increase the Pell grant so they can stay. We're going to give an income tax credit so they can stay in school. We're going to give them work opportunities on campus so they can stay in school. Because that's what the economists said, that's what the venture capitalists said, that's the captains of industry said needs to be done. Don't lose that, because when this economy re-emerges, we need those people to be competitive with the rest of the world.

Yes, we're going to help school districts and school construction so that young students can go to school in a cleaner, better environment, so they'll be connected to the latest technology, so they'll have the educational opportunities. And it will be a safe school. It will be a modern school. Yes, we're going to help them out and do that because they don't have the ability to do that because your economic policies froze municipal bonds and school bonds where people voted to impose taxes on themselves to improve their schools, to improve their cities. But the credit markets are seized; so we're trying to help them out for the time being until those markets unfreeze.

And, yes, \$300 billion was given to the Bush administration and Secretary Paulson, and so far it appears it was given without conditions in terms of any effort by the big banks to unfreeze the credit markets to lend to small businesses, to lend to families in need.

Yes, we're changing policy. And we're doing it at the direction of the American people because the policy you gave them for 8 years was a disaster for them, their families, their retirements, their wages, their health care. They want to go in a different direction, and we will take them in a different direction. We will take them to job creation. We'll take them to better education. And, hopefully, we'll take them to a stronger economy on the advice, on the advice, with all due respect, of not the other side of the aisle, but of economists from the left to the right of impeccable credentials who said the

only question about this package really is, is it large enough?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address the Chair with their remarks.

□ 1900

Mr. CAMP. I thank the Chair for that statement.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So much material and so little time. You know, we heard the President in his speech talking about putting aside petty recriminations, and he characterized that as, actually, childish arguments. And I think that some of the tone that I have heard tonight, we can rise above.

You know, I find it ironic that the gentleman from California referred favorably, maybe for the first time in his career, the first time in my hearing, favorably quoting and referring to Republican economists as "persuasive." I had never heard that from him before, Mr. Chairman.

But I would like to quote from our President. In his State of the Union Message, he said something that I think actually brings us all together, it's really poignant, and I think it's beautiful. In fact, it says it has been risk takers, the doers, the makers of things who have carried us up the long rugged path towards prosperity and freedom. The market's power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched.

Here we are, on the verge of the majority spending \$825 billion in a spending plan, the likes of which we have not seen before, with only \$40 million in tax relief for small business. When the President came in, he seemed surprised at those numbers, by comparison, \$40 million to the risk takers that we all say are the economic engine that are going to move us into the future.

We can do better, and I think it's incumbent upon us to take up that challenge.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) is recognized and controls 10 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Our committee's portion, the infrastructure recovery program is targeted. It will be transparent and recipients will be held accountable, and the investments are desperately needed. The construction sector is suffering the highest unemployment rate of any industrial sector, 15.3 percent, 1.4 million construction workers out of a job.

Fully implemented, as our committee proposes, we can have a million workers on a construction site in June of this year and generate \$325 billion in total economic activity when fully implemented, jobs that cannot be

outsourced to other countries, using materials that are made in America, not outsourced beyond our shores.

Transparency, we require reporting by every State DOT, every transit agency, every airport authority, every 30 days on the contract awarded, by contract, on the specific jobs, job description and payroll, which we will receive and make public through hearings that we will conduct 30 days after the funding is allocated to the States and every 60 days thereafter.

Accountability, an amendment which I expect or hope to offer tomorrow made in order by the Rules Committee, will have a requirement that funds be committed in 90 days, use it or lose it.

I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009".

With more than 1.4 million construction workers out of work, and the construction industry suffering the highest unemployment rate (15.3 percent) of any industrial sector, this bill is urgently needed to put America back to work. The infrastructure investments funded by this bill will create good, family-wage jobs—jobs that cannot be outsourced to another country, because the work must be done here in the U.S. on our roads, bridges, transit and rail systems, airports, waterways, wastewater treatment facilities, and Federal buildings.

For more than a year now, I have worked to ensure that infrastructure investment plays a key role in our Nation's economic recovery.

I thank Chairman OBEY for working with me in this effort. We consulted extensively on the transportation and infrastructure provisions in the bill. Although the legislation before us today does not include everything I had proposed, it is a very good start, and I am hopeful it can be improved and fine-tuned as deliberations continue.

In December 2008, I proposed to House Leadership that the economic recovery legislation include at least \$85 billion for transportation, environmental, and other public infrastructure investments. H.R. 1 includes approximately \$63 billion for these programs.

My proposal adhered to the following six principles:

1. Funds must be invested in ready-to-go projects. I believe we need an aggressive timetable for the use of funds, including a 90-day, "use-it-or-lose-it" requirement for 50 percent of the funds, which will produce a "quick hit" that will jump-start our economy and create a substantial number of new construction jobs by June.

2. Funds must be used to create green-collar jobs and invest in projects that decrease our dependence on foreign oil and address global climate change.

3. The steel, iron, and manufactured goods required for these projects must be manufactured in the United States.

4. Wherever possible, funds must be distributed by existing statutory formulas, with no earmarks, to expedite the flow of funds.

5. Transparency and accountability in the use of funds must be achieved.

6. States and other recipients of formula funds must maintain their effort in terms of current State and local investment levels.

These principles are, in large measure, reflected in the legislation before us today.

Although the use-it-or-lose-it deadline in the bill is currently set at 180 days, I am hopeful

it can be shortened to 90 days, and I will be offering an amendment to do so.

On December 18, I had a lengthy conference call with 14 State Secretaries of Transportation and Chief Executive Officers of public transit agencies. I outlined for them my 90-day, use-it-or-lose-it proposal, which would require them to obligate 50 percent of the funds allocated to them within 90 days.

Every one of the participants on the conference call enthusiastically affirmed that they are ready to go within 90 days and can meet the use-it-or-lose-it requirement.

In another conference call earlier this month and at a Committee hearing last week, we were again assured that State and local grant recipients are proactively preparing to meet tight deadlines and will be able to use these funds quickly.

Despite these assurances from State and local officials, some here in Washington are skeptical that a 90-day deadline can be met. This skepticism is why the use-it-or-lose-it deadline was extended to 180 days in last week's Appropriations Committee mark-up.

Ninety days is a tight deadline, but that is exactly what we need.

Business as usual is not good enough anymore. If the purpose of this legislation is to be achieved, then we must set tight deadlines, and hold everyone—from Federal agencies to State and local grant recipients—accountable to them.

I firmly believe that the infrastructure funds provided by this bill can—with the right incentives—produce a substantial number of jobs by June, while also improving our deteriorating infrastructure and laying the foundation for our future economic growth.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and Chairman OLVER, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, for working with me throughout the development of this legislation. I strongly urge your support for H.R. 1, a true investment in America's future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY).

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, with 11 million Americans out of work, we indeed should be concerned about Americans out of work and helping Americans to have jobs.

Tomorrow the House will vote on a bill of some \$835 billion as an economic stimulus and spending package. Thirty billion dollars of that will be for infrastructure spending for roads and bridges, some \$20 million for electronic medical reports, both worthy causes, which perhaps should be put into the highway section, but that's as it is. What's key here is are these really for American jobs?

The electronic medical records is important because it allows hospitals to have their records on computers so doctors can access them from everywhere competently and confidently, and can help reduce millions of dollars of waste and deaths that occur from hospital errors.

However, in the Energy and Commerce Committee a few days ago I offered an amendment to say let's guarantee that the software work and the applications of that technology be done in America. It's too easy, at the stroke of a keyboard, to send electronic data across the globe where these software applications for hospitals could be done.

So we put an amendment in. The chairman agreed to it. The committee unanimously agreed to, but, mysteriously, when the bill was printed, that and a few other Republican amendments were omitted.

Tonight I was at the Rules Committee asking them to please restore this amendment to say if we are going to spend \$20 billion to help American jobs, let's make sure we have a clause in this bill that helps American jobs.

There's another amendment I offered too that says for construction and other parts of this bill let's also use that for American jobs. Let's not have the same mistake that occurred when we approved building a fence line at the border with Mexico, and it turned out it was done using a loophole with Chinese steel. Our concrete, our rebar, the cars that are going to be bought supposedly with this bill ought to be made in America.

From the iron mines to the manufacturers, to the mills, let's use it to buy America. Let's return those amendments to this bill. If we really are going to be serious about American jobs, let's make this American jobs.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Chair of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

For 8 long years our Republican colleagues stood shoulder-to-shoulder with George Bush as our country accelerated its slide toward a third world infrastructure. The collapse of the bridge in Minnesota is perhaps the signal moment of the Bush administration. What did they do before and what have they done after for our infrastructure? Nothing.

They didn't believe in investing in our public infrastructure. Tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. Tax cuts never built a single highway. Tax cuts never built a transit system. Tax cuts never replaced a bridge.

Tax cuts are not the answer to all of America's problems. We need to invest in our public infrastructure in this country. The most solid core point of this bill is what we are debating right now, more than \$40 billion of investment in the future of America putting our highways and our bridges back in good repair, rebuilding our transit systems, beginning to provide new capacity, to get people more efficiently to work, to avoid the costs of congestion, the costs of the deficient services we suffer.

These are jobs. I heard someone, some bizarre Republican stand up ear-

lier and say something about the difference between work and jobs. This is work that puts Americans to work, and it's jobs, and it rebuilds our country. I don't quite get what point that person was making. And it's not a tax cut. It's real investment.

I can justify borrowing money to build a bridge or a transit system that will serve the next two or three or four or five generations of Americans a lot more than I can justify a tax cut which is gone tomorrow and did nothing to rebuild our future.

They lack vision. In this we will buy American products. "Buy American" is the theme of transportation policy in this country. We will buy buses made in America. We will even start buying street cars for the first time made in America.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. We are going to rebuild our bridges made with steel in America, concrete sourced in America, labor of American workers. This is the core of this bill. It's not enough, in my opinion, and I have made that clear and made some angry by saying that, as has the chairman.

But it is a good, solid down payment and a solid core for an American recovery with these investments. Stop talking just about one-note tax cuts. They didn't work for George Bush. They are not going to work today. We need to begin real investment and rebuilding our future, transportation infrastructure. This is the core of this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I would point out that it was a Democrat Congress that for decades robbed from the highway trust fund, and it was the Republican Congress, with the Republican President, who insisted for the first time that all the highway fuel dollars would go to actually building highways and bridges in America.

I would note too, Republicans doubled the research and development budget of America, not Democrats.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, it should be evident to anyone looking on tonight, from the passion that's displayed on both sides of the aisle, this is a serious debate. The American people are hurting. Many millions of Americans have lost their jobs and many more are worried that they will be next.

And so we come to this floor tonight to begin a debate on legislation that should, in the best of worlds, be a result of a thorough vetting and a thor-

ough and bipartisan negotiation over what would be, on balance, in the best interests of the American people. But this legislation falls far short of that standard, and I rise to oppose it.

I commend the President of the United States today for coming to Capitol Hill and meeting with House Republicans. It was a frank and cordial discussion. The conversation is not compromised, and the American people deserve to know that Democrats in Congress have completely ignored our new President's call for bipartisanship in the formation of this stimulus bill.

In reality, House Democrats have used this moment of national economic crisis to fund big government priorities under the guise of stimulating the economy. As I told President Obama today, we take him at his word, but we urge him to make good on his pledge to challenge his party to set aside partisan differences and to bring the best ideas from both parties to the table, and this bill does not accomplish that.

The promises of change and bipartisanship ring hollow in the face of a stimulus bill that does little more than fund a wish list of long-standing liberal spending priorities.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, what is \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts going to do to create jobs in Indiana? What does \$200 million to plant sod on the National Mall going to do to put people back to work in your State, or \$400 million for climate change research going to do to get America working again.

The truth is the bill that we will consider tomorrow, fashioned entirely by the majority in this House, won't stimulate anything but more government and more debt. The slow and wasteful spending of the House Democrat bill is a disservice to millions of Americans, and Republicans are disappointed, but the American people should be disappointed as well. These are serious times, and what will come to the floor tomorrow is not a serious effort to address this crisis with reform.

Republicans have a plan. We don't claim to have the exclusive right to all the best ideas in the world, but the time-honored tradition of stimulus from this Chamber has always included real and immediate and significant tax relief for working families, small businesses and family farms. Handing out rebate checks this year, like we did last year, will likely have as little result stimulating our economy as it did before.

And so we will take our case to the American people. We may lose on the floor tomorrow, but the American people will have a choice between slow and wasteful government spending and a plan that will bring tax relief to working families and small businesses.

I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to point out that on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure the Republicans have been engaged fully from

2007 all through 2008 in fashioning a stimulus initiative. Their ideas have been fully engaged and they have participated in hearings and in the crafting of our portion of this bill.

So whatever criticism there may be of other committees, I say it doesn't apply in our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. In fact, Mr. MICA, my good friend, said our portion is a very good bill.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), Chair of the Water Resources Subcommittee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I want to thank the Chair of Transportation, as well as the Chair of Appropriations, for the hard work they put into this.

Mr. Chairman, you know I strongly support the underlying bill. I know that I understand it differently than some others here. But if we keep doing the same thing that we have been doing for the last 8 years, we will get the same results. You can't do the same thing and expect the results to change.

The needed funds for our Nation's roads, bridges, transit systems, airport and water-related infrastructure are very much needed. Over the past 2 years, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment has held numerous hearings on the Nation's water-related infrastructure needs, whether it is the \$300 billion to \$400 billion investment needed to restore and upgrade our Nation's network of wastewater treatment infrastructure, or the projection of \$50 billion to \$60 billion for vital projects of the Corps of Engineers.

The water-related infrastructure needs of this Nation are struggling and growing ever longer, and the longer it is put off, the more it will cost.

□ 1915

Each \$1 billion of Federal funds invested in infrastructure creates and sustains approximately 34,000 to 47,000 jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activities. The \$3 billion in infrastructure investment funding in the bill for the State of Texas will provide a real tangible benefit to the 700,000 individuals currently unemployed in our State, whether as a paycheck for those responsible for constructing these vital projects or through increased productivity for small businesses that produce the materials needed for these vital infrastructure projects.

These people cannot pay taxes. They don't have jobs.

However, unlike other economic recovery proposals, infrastructure investment provides not only a short-term benefit to American families, it also provides a long-term benefit in terms of sustainable and reliable infrastructure, as well as the potential for increased productivity for the Nation's economy through the efficient movement of goods and services.

It also can enhance the overall quality of the Nation's water-related environment through the implementation of environmental restora-

tion projects by the Corps of Engineers, and through the control of pollutant discharges from combined sewer and sanitary sewer upgrades.

Finally, infrastructure investment provides one of the only benefits that cannot be shipped off to foreign lands. The direct beneficiaries of domestic infrastructure projects are our towns, our local communities, our constituents.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank the ranking member for generously yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, here are a half dozen of many reasons to oppose this legislation. We should wait and gauge the impact of the \$350 billion in TARP funds already approved before spending even more. Spending another \$825 billion—\$6,000 for every taxpayer in America—will inevitably hike inflation and increase taxes, further damaging the economy.

Much of the money will be used to bail out States that have overspent their budget. This rewards bad behavior. What happened to the "era of responsibility?"

This is not free money. It's a non-secure loan extracted from the American people. Let them keep the dollars and decide how to spend them. It would be far better to provide tax incentives and investment credits to the small businesses that create 70 percent of all new jobs in America. This massive monstrosity of spending is the wrong kind of change. It will only make the economic crisis wider, deeper, and longer.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the Chair of our Economic Development Subcommittee, the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his very important and brilliant work on this bill. I thought I heard my friend talk about putting money in people's pockets. Have you forgotten that is exactly what we did with the last stimulus bill? And, guess what? It went to pay the Saudis, who are now enjoying that. People paid off their high gas bills, they paid down their credit cards. Understand that people are afraid to spend money.

What does this bill do? This is not about "the economy," it's not about "the bailout." This bill is about jobs. What it says is if you give a person not money in his pocket, but a job, you have a better chance of reviving your economy.

The GAO says, indeed, if done properly, a public infrastructure program will pay for itself, and more, over time, by increasing productivity. That is the reason we focus on infrastructure and it's interesting to know that many on the other side are pointing in that direction as well.

I am not against some of the tax cuts, if properly done. But the reason

we focus on infrastructure is that it alone has a track record of waking up other parts of the economy. That's what we want to do. This is about jobs. This is not about some generic economy. It is the multiplier effect that we are after. We are after jobs that then create support jobs on down the line. And there is no other expenditure that has been shown to do that as well as infrastructure.

We've got a job to do to make sure, as the chairman says, that this gets done, and gets done quickly. But there can be no debate. Even as we heard testimony, investments in infrastructure have a broader effect and a bigger benefit on the economy than, for example, tax cuts, or any form of tax relief.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the President has asked for swift action to spur the economy in the need to usher in a new era of responsibility. I also agree that Congress must act immediately to help get our economy back on track.

My concern with the bill that we are addressing here tonight is that it is acting irresponsibly. This stimulus bill has essentially now turned into a supplemental spending bill. The budget deficit is already more than \$1 trillion this year alone. What is Congress proposing? More borrowing and more spending.

After this bill passes, Mr. Chairman, the annual budget deficit will surpass \$2 trillion in just 1 year. Just this 1 year. An economic stimulus should be quick and it should be immediate. However, the recent analysis by the Congressional Budget Office shows that only 7 to 8 percent of the infrastructure spending, which is valuable in this plan, will be delivered in the economy in the first year alone, and less than half will be spent in the first 2 years.

Mr. Chair, a real fiscal stimulus is one that will put people back to work and focuses like a laser beam to help protect and preserve and, most importantly, create jobs. Why aren't we focusing tonight on helping small businesses do what they do best?

We need to make sure that we are allowing those small businesses, the entrepreneurs, the risk-takers, the innovators, and the self-employed, do what they do best, and that is create jobs. Unfortunately, this bill has become a grab bag of special interest spending, and many of these may be some worthwhile projects, but they should not be snuck into a stimulus bill.

Instead, let's focus on changing politics as usual and working together and finding real solutions to put people back to work.

Mr. OBERSTAR. How much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield the remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. As a new Member of this body, this is going to be one of the most important votes I cast. And to hear some of the rhetoric tonight from the other side makes one think of Charles Dickens. Are there no workhouses?

We are in the worst economic meltdown in 76 years. The middle class is crying for relief. We are on a precipice, and this body must act. I feel duty-bound to cast my vote in favor of this legislation because it is action. It is designed to spur infrastructure. It is designed to provide middle-class tax relief.

And when I hear language of special interest, I wonder if we mean by that our State and local governments that are hemorrhaging red ink and need the relief contained in this legislation. As someone who's just come from local government, I know firsthand how every State and every locality in this country is hurting.

I intend to support this legislation, especially the infrastructure provisions in it that will get people back to work and spur local economies.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am interested in the comment just made by the gentleman from Northern Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY. If the gentleman would take a question, I'd be pleased to yield to him for an answer.

Mr. CONNOLLY, would you be interested in taking a question? I was interested in your comments, because you said, Mr. CONNOLLY from Northern Virginia—

The CHAIR. The gentleman will address the Chair, please.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, the gentleman said these are the worst economic times, and this will stimulate infrastructure. I was wondering if the gentleman was aware that only 7 percent, or \$26 billion of the \$274 billion in infrastructure money, will be spent by the end of this budget year. And adding the interest, this stimulus, which will exceed \$1.1 trillion, will cost each and every American \$3,300 in this economy.

Does the gentleman think that that is a wise idea? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, if I understand the gentleman's question, first of all, I think his numbers are not correct, if I look at the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I think it's considerably more than the number the gentleman has cited.

I also think the gentleman fails to recognize that there's cumulatively \$120 billion of relief for State and local governments. I would also point out to him that every State and every locality virtually in this country is hemorrhaging red ink.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I would

ask the gentleman to tell the House if he believes that in this worst economy that it's appropriate to put in place a policy that makes it so that each and every American is liable for \$3,300 more; \$3,300 more for each and every single American. Is that an appropriate policy to be put in place at this time, I would ask the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I don't believe that is the appropriate question.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman. That is indeed the appropriate question. And that is why you hear individuals on our side of the aisle fighting on behalf of the American taxpayer, fighting on behalf of American jobs, fighting on behalf of appropriate policy that will in fact stimulate the economy.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think the opposite is true. I think the gentleman is fighting for policies that prove to be a failure.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has control of the time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. We all want our economy to turn around. The question really isn't is this too much or too big, although I believe it to be. The question is, Will it work, and, What else is in this bill?

I want to highlight an item that is buried in this bill. The Comparative Effectiveness Research Council. \$1.1 billion for this board. In the language, it states, regarding health care, "Those items, procedures and interventions that are most effective to prevent, control, and treat health conditions will be utilized, while those no longer found to be effective and, in some cases, more expensive, will no longer be prescribed."

Mr. Chairman, this is the beginning and the foundation of nationalized health care.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman. In fact, the Secretary of Health and Human Services said in his book that this body would have recommendations that may not have teeth because all Federal health programs would have to abide by them. But Congress would go back and further the board's recommendations. It could, for example, link the tax exclusion for health insurance to insurance companies that comply with the board's recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed the foundation of rationing of American health care for each and every American. Not only will there be no stimulus in this bill, there will be major policy changes to health care; nationalized health care on its way, courtesy of the majority party.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) now controls 5 minutes of the time.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I'd like to thank Chairman OBEY as well for all his work,

and members of the committee on both sides of this bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee, it's my great privilege to work with Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL to advance our Nation's capabilities in scientific research and technological innovation.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act contains critical funding for the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science at the Department of Energy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and NASA. It also includes significant funding for research and development in advanced energy technologies.

These critical investments will create high-quality jobs, strengthen our economic competitiveness, and improve access to clean, affordable energy.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I'd like to inquire of the Chair the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMP. And on the other side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 51 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. At this time we will reserve our time until it becomes a little more balanced, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

□ 1930

Mr. WU. I thank the gentlelady, and I rise in support of the underlying legislation.

I want to commend President Obama, his administration, Speaker PELOSI, Chairman OBEY and Chairman GORDON for their leadership and commitment to ensure that this bill provides strong funding for science, technology, and long-term economic growth in order to get our economy back on track. We need to rebuild from the ground up. We need to invest in research that will create the jobs of the 21st century, including those jobs in health information technology.

Health IT has the potential to reduce medical errors, decrease inefficient, unnecessary, duplicative treatments that cost our health care system \$300 billion annually. Health IT should lower our health care costs while improving the quality and safety of care. Health IT is economic stimulus.

However, one study states that more than 40,000 health care IT workers will be needed in health care facilities, and jobs already exist in this field. We just need qualified workers. Without the staff needed, our investments in health IT will do little to meet the potential of this field. That is why I am happy to see the provisions of the 10,000 Trained by 2010 Act, a bill that I introduced, are included as part of this legislation. My legislation helps train individuals

in health IT, and provides the seed corn to create the jobs of our new economy in a field that will help curb the cost of health care for years to come. I urge my colleagues to support the provision and the legislation.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think when I yielded time earlier in the day, I shortchanged the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) by 5 minutes. I would like to yield an additional 5 minutes of my time to her.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman will control an additional 5 minutes of the time.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Bill of 2009.

We are entering a new era of job creation through science, research, and technology, and this bill makes timely targeted investments to create high-quality jobs, strengthen American competitiveness, and improve access to clean affordable energy.

The bill allocates funds to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which is in my congressional district in Maryland, for competitive construction grants for research science buildings at colleges, universities, and other research organizations and to coordinate research efforts of laboratories and national research facilities by setting standards for manufacturing.

The bill also allocates funds to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to put more scientists to work doing climate change, important climate change research, including earth science recommended by the National Academies, satellite sensors that measure solar radiation critical to understanding climate change.

I am proud that this bill includes \$10 billion for science research facilities and instrumentation, to focus American brain power and education on solving the energy and climate challenges.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. GIFFORDS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. This is an investment for the 21st century. It is for our children, it is for our grandchildren. I applaud Chairman GORDON and the House leadership for making these investments, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill. This is about the future.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I represent the capital region of New York State, an area which, led by Thomas Edison, pioneered a revolution in electricity which changed our society a century ago. I believe it is with that

spirit that we look to take bold action with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

This package contains some \$4 billion for job training, which is essential to preparing the American workers to compete for the jobs of the future. It also contains \$2 billion for alternative energy research, and \$11 billion to develop and build the next generation energy grid. These are crucial investments that will create high-paying jobs right now and make our country more secure and energy efficient into the future.

In these difficult economic times, we must not forget our commitment to our children and grandchildren. The stimulus bill will provide over \$140 billion to make sure that our education system can move forward into the 21st century. We must act now and boldly to move our country in the right direction and to provide relief for our overburdened working families.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

(Mr. BOCCIERI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Chairman, the people of Ohio's 16th District elected me to fight for them and their tax dollars. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is about putting America first. It is about investing in our country. Some on the other side didn't bat an eye when they voted to use American tax dollars to rebuild Iraq, spending billions on new roads and bridges there. There was no outrage during those spending days.

Our people are hurting. Our people are struggling and asking us for leadership. It is time to put partisanship aside. In this time of great need, investing in our schools, our roads, our bridges is about making America stronger. Ohio will receive a much-needed economic boost with these resources, and we will invest in the future of our country. Ohio needs the estimated \$1.5 billion in infrastructure improvements to help create jobs. Creating jobs in alternative energy like fuel cells or plug-in hybrids being researched in my district will move us away from the dependence on foreign oil. This bill will help America innovate and invest in the jobs of tomorrow.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1. This recovery package supports the development of new advanced vehicle technologies that will lower emissions, improve fuel economy, and create new jobs across the country. This bill includes \$2 billion to build new manufacturing facilities for

the kinds of advanced vehicle batteries and battery components that will power the next generation of vehicles.

We are facing a global credit crisis, and auto companies around the world are struggling. Foreign governments are taking dramatic steps to help their own auto companies. If we are going to ensure the next generation of green manufacturing jobs are created here in the United States, we have to invest now in these advanced technologies. This bill helps ensure that we do not trade our dependence on foreign oil for a dependence on foreign batteries and other technologies.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is good for Michigan and it is good for America. I urge its passage here today.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the so-called stimulus bill for a number of reasons, both process and procedural. On the process, we had 1 day to consider 270 pages of text in the Energy and Commerce Committee. Five Republican amendments were accepted during the markup; three of those five were stricken from the bill before it came to the floor, and the fourth one, which is in the bill, is in the bill in a different form than which it was agreed upon during the negotiations during the markup. I don't think that is really good form.

On the substance of the bill, most of the Energy and Commerce title is really social program policy and spending. It may be good, but it is not stimulative in and of itself in terms of what we are here to do.

There is one title in the energy section which I think my friends on the majority side need to know about; it is something called decoupling. It gives a utility the right to petition a State that if the consumers in that State do all these energy efficient measures and they decrease their use of electricity, by decoupling what the consumers pay for it the utility has a revenue guarantee: Use less, pay more. I mean, as insane as that sounds, it is in this bill. I offered an amendment to strike that from the bill in the committee and it was on a party line vote rejected. Every Democrat voted to keep that in the bill; every Republican voted to remove it.

So if this actually becomes law, if a governor of a State acts positively on a petition from a utility in that State, the utility can decouple what it charges your voters for what you pay for electricity regardless of how much you use. If somebody cuts their electricity use 20 percent, they pay the same. Now, I don't know about most voters, but I know my voters, if they

conserve and consume less electricity, they want to pay less; but under this bill, they are going to pay more. How is that stimulative to the economy? I think that is actually destructive of the economy.

So, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, while there is some good in this bill, there is so much that is really not stimulative, and there is some stuff that is just really harmful that we should vote "no."

There is one other thing. Under this bill, they struck the amendment by Mr. STEARNS that says if a millionaire wants to get on COBRA and get his health care paid for two-thirds of the premium, he has got to prove that he is not a millionaire, that he doesn't have income and he doesn't have assets. They accepted that on a voice vote in the committee, but they struck it out. So there is no income test, there is no means test. Basically, Mr. Madoff, who just defrauded billions and billions of dollars, is going to be eligible for COBRA assistance under this bill. Vote "no."

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a Representative from the State of Arizona, the State that is the most abundant State in terms of sunshine, I would like to take the remainder of the time to talk about my support for solar power.

A strong solar power industry is going to create good jobs, it is going to increase our competitiveness internationally, and it is also going to help us reduce the threat of climate change. This form of renewable energy is going to be good for our economy, it is absolutely going to create much-needed jobs, and it is really going to focus on that next 21st century economy. It is going to really focus on our future. So I am pleased that this legislation includes some solar investments such as research and basic science, basic energy science, as well as applied research and development. The bill also includes critical funding for critical research into advanced transmission and energy storage technologies, what Representative PETERS from Michigan spoke of earlier.

Innovation in these two areas is essential to unlocking solar power's full potential. But that is not all that is included in this bill. We also are looking at language that contains critical financial incentives to support the development of solar power generating facilities. These provisions offer direct grants to qualified renewable energy products in lieu of the investment tax credits, also known as the ITC.

In the current economic downturn, the ITC cannot achieve its full potential, because many entities that would like to invest in solar power do not have taxable income. Therefore, this grant program is essential.

Unfortunately, the grant programs application is limited. It falls short of supporting large-scale solar projects

with long lead times. We have seen many of these projects proposed throughout the Southwest and in other areas. That is why I have offered an amendment to expand this provision to include the large solar projects with the greatest potential to boost our economy. They are going to maximize job creation, foster greater investments and dramatically expand the amount of power our Nation gets from solar energy.

So as this bill moves forward, I urge the House and Senate to consider this amendment. We have this opportunity to take advantage and facilitate large and small scale projects. I would like us to help achieve President Obama's goal of doubling our Nation's renewable power capacity over the next 3 years. We are looking at 40,000 new jobs and \$8 billion in investment. This is exactly the kind of bold action our Nation needs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chairwoman of the Small Business Administration, now controls 5 minutes of the time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I rise in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which will help restore stability to our weakened economy and drive growth within the small business community.

Mr. Chairman, in a recent hearing my committee met an entrepreneur, Thomas Rankin, whose 83-year-old family business, Ramer Lumber, had managed to weather the great Depression but wasn't able to survive the current downturn. This past November, his business closed its door for good.

All across the country, countless small business firms are facing the same fate. Recovery efforts enacted last fall have not trickled down to Main Street. From Mom and Pop restaurants to technology startups, small firms of every kind are suffering. What we need now are solutions that work for entrepreneurs. After all, they are the ones that are promoting growth and they are the ones with a proven track record of creating jobs.

□ 1945

But, unfortunately, a combination of restrictive lending and tightening credit has stunted small business growth, preventing entrepreneurs from playing their historic role of economic catalyst.

The Recovery and Reinvestment Act will help turn the tide. To begin with, \$30 billion in targeted tax measures would allow struggling startups to stay

afloat. For example, the bill will repeal the burdensome 3 percent withholding requirement for government contractors and allow for enhanced expensing for small businesses' purchases. For cash-strapped entrepreneurs, these initiatives could make the difference between meeting payroll and making layoffs.

The Recovery and Reinvestment Act also promises to thaw frozen small business lending and increase guarantees for new loans. At the same time, it will reopen the secondary market which has ground to a halt. Taken all together, these initiatives will put \$13 billion into the hands of small businesses immediately, allowing entrepreneurs to do what they do best, create jobs. Small business lending provisions within the Recovery and Reinvestment Act will keep and create over 400,000 jobs. And at the end of the day, that is what small businesses do best, create jobs.

With unemployment at a 16-year high, let's not kid ourselves. There can be no recovery without job creation. That is why it is so critical that entrepreneurs have the resources they need to not just survive the downturn but to emerge from it stronger and ready to bring our economy back on track.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say thank you to my colleagues who are joining me on the floor to fight this stimulus bill that we have before us. Actually, using "stimulus" on this piece of legislation is an incorrect term, because when we look at this, what we have learned today is primarily that this is just another spending bill.

I find it so interesting. I don't know if my colleagues have had the opportunity to look at what the information we've had from the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO. And I know time and again, when we were in the majority, you all would take the CBO figures as the gospel. So it's a little bit of a head scratcher to us. You want to say you have a stimulus bill. But it's a spending bill. It's going to cost \$1.1 trillion when you add the interest. But, interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, that money doesn't go into the economy quickly. And I think that is what our constituents are so interested to learn.

Out of this \$836 billion, and you add the interest in and you are at \$1.16 trillion, now, \$92 billion of that is released within the next 12 months. That is 2009 money. And then in 2010 you get another \$225 billion, and in 2011 you get \$159 billion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, "stimulus" means something immediate that is targeted, that is focused and that is going to address a problem. And we don't see that in this piece of legislation.

It is more spending on top of more spending. It is \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts. It is \$16 billion for Pell Grants. It is \$2.1 billion for Head Start. It is \$200 million for the National Mall. That is not stimulus.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That is not stimulus. That is government spending. That is growth of government problems. If you want to stimulate the economy, reduce taxes and leave money with the taxpayers, pay attention to small business and listen to their needs.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, the Democrats in Congress are building a "Bridge to Bankruptcy" for a lot of small businesses, for a lot of American families and for the U.S. government.

I urge my colleagues to stand strongly against H.R. 1.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON).

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for the opportunity to speak on this matter of utmost importance to the American people. Nothing is more critical at this moment in time than creating jobs. Days ago I learned that an important employer in my district is cutting 20,000 jobs. This is terrifying news to many of my constituents because each lost job forces a family to make difficult decisions. Health insurance becomes more difficult to maintain. College costs become more overwhelming. Mortgage payments become impossible to meet. It's clear we must act decisively, immediately, and on a scale that is bold, innovative and that will create new jobs to grow our economy.

It's critical that we invest in American infrastructure, including schools, energy, technology and small businesses. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will do exactly that.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, as a result of restricting lending and vanishing credit, small firms spanning every sector are folding at alarming rates. This is particularly troubling because they comprise 95 percent of American industry and employ half of the private sector workforce.

When these businesses disappear, so do many millions of American jobs. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act offers an opportunity to keep the jobs we still have and to create hundreds of thousands more. Just as importantly, it is an investment in our Nation's entrepreneurs, the people creating jobs, driving innovation and strengthening the backbone of our economy.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) controls the next 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we can debate this bill endlessly tonight, but no one can contest this point, this fact; we are in the midst of the greatest, longest and deepest recession since the Great Depression.

The question before us is simply this: Will we act, act now and act boldly in an effort to restore our economy to a healthy status, or will we run the risk that this recession will become even deeper and longer?

Now, I know that some doubt or disdain the steps taken so far by the government. Let me say up until a week ago that government was the Bush administration. I know that some question whether or not these steps have done any good. But let's go back to September and October. We witnessed a complete collapse of confidence in the global financial system and a wrenching credit crunch for corporate and consumer borrowers both. The spread between the 3-month LIBOR, the London Interbank Lending Rate, and 3-month Treasuries, which is a proxy for the willingness of banks to lend money, reached 360 basis points, 3.6 percent. Many feared, with good reason, that we would soon be in a cash-and-carry economy.

We passed the bill which provided additional liquidity. It hasn't accomplished all we hoped it would. But the spread that I just mentioned has fallen from 360 basis points to 100 basis points, still double the normal spread, but that is a big improvement and one clear indication that government actions have produced some good effect. Sure, they are not lending as much as we would like. Financing for consumer durables like autos and homes is not where we'd like it to be. But we are a lot better off than we would have been if the government had not intervened.

Now, I know some recoil at the enormous costs we are incurring. And I'll be frank with you, I find it stunning. \$825 billion. But the cost of doing nothing is not zero. Far from it. What is the cost of doing nothing? Well, the CBO tells us that the cost of doing nothing, nothing tonight, nothing further, could be as much as a 2.2 percent contraction in GDP over 2009, the current year, and an unemployment rate climbing to 9 to 10 percent. Other forecasters predict even worse. We had several before our committee today. Mark Zandi of Moody's Economy.Com forecasted today a 3.4 percent contraction in the economy in 2009 with unemployment soaring to 11 percent next year.

Still people say, well, why does the government need to respond? Why can't we let this recession, like others in the past, run its course and self-correct? Well, our economy is up against

some major head winds. Consumers have cut spending because their principal asset, their home, has plummeted in value by 20 percent, and some say it may go 20 percent more before we reach a reasonable trend line. There are huge overhangs in the real estate market. Real estate may have led us out of past recessions, but not this one. Nor will automobiles. If anything, they are in deeper doldrums. With credit shrinking and retail sales falling, it is unlikely that the manufacturing sector will step up the production of goods for which there is little market. Finally, with the Fed fund rates at virtually zero, monetary policy is at the end of its tether.

What is left, if we were to do something, if we were to intervene, if we were to restore health to our economy? A major fiscal response by the government is the only viable option left on the table.

Now, what could a \$825 billion stimulus bill accomplish? CBO forecasts an economy in 2009 or GDP equal to \$14.2 trillion if we don't act. That is an economy operating at 6.8 percent less than its reasonable capacity, its potential. CBO predicts the same for 2010. My friend, that is a gap of nearly \$1 trillion in potential production, goods and services that people in this country could enjoy and use, \$1 trillion a year if we don't act.

According to CBO, the recovery bill will raise output between 1.3 percent and 3.6 percent by the end of this year. If we take the middle of that range, 2.5 percent, that is an additional \$350 billion worth of goods and services purchased which businesses will then generate into several million badly-needed jobs.

A recovery bill that invests in America and begins to repair our stock of capital will yield dividends down the road. If investing in our schools, our children, our workforce, our roads, our bridges, our ports, our schools, our waterways, our transit and our scientific and technological base did not produce solid economic returns, how would our Nation have ever emerged to lead the world.

I urge everyone to support H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for the fine work that he is doing on these moments that we have together.

One guarantee that we do have from the stimulus bill that we can count on, that we can take to the bank, on which there will be no disagreement and no dissent is this: If we pass this \$825 billion stimulus tomorrow, and it seems to be a certain thing because the majority has the votes, and if we add to that the debt service which would be over \$300 billion added on top of that, bringing us to a total of over \$1.1 trillion, the certainty, the guarantee that

we will take to the bank, that we will need to look at the American people straight in the eye and be four square honest in telling them is this: You will encounter punishingly high tax increases at every level of the economic spectrum. It's a given. We have to.

Why can we say this with certainty? Because someone has to pay this bill. When you go out to eat, the check comes and someone has to pay for it. Maybe a nice person at the other table will pay for your check. But at the end of the day, someone is paying that check. And it's the American people that are paying for this party.

Make no mistake. This stimulus bill has very little to do with stimulating the economy and helping the average American. This is a bailout for big government. And let's get ready. We are looking at massive tax increases and we are looking at massive inflation or both. In fact, we could be looking at hyperinflation.

I don't want to be "Debbie Downer" bringing bad news to the American public, but it's a certainty. If you spend money at this level, and consider we are spending almost as much money on this stimulus bill as we will spend in our discretionary spending, take it to the bank. That is our future.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration today will saddle generations of taxpayers with hundreds of billions of dollars of debt and will, I fear, not lead this country to real economic recovery.

The Democrats' bill has a starting price of \$825 billion—enough money to give every person living in poverty in the United States \$22,000.

In fact, the total cost of this one piece of legislation is almost as much as the annual discretionary budget for the entire Federal Government.

To make matters worse, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the real cost of the legislation will be more than \$1 trillion.

CBO reports that if Congress borrows more than \$800 billion, it will burden future generations with an additional \$347 billion in interest payments. That totals more than \$1.1 trillion.

And, regrettably, that total includes frivolous spending on items such as \$600 million for new cars for the Federal Government and \$21 million for sod to fill in the mall after the inauguration.

We must not forget our responsibility to the taxpayer simply because we label something a crisis or even a response to a crisis.

The Democrats' have tried to sell this proposal as a transportation and infrastructure investment package. And, I'm all for investing in rebuilding our Nation's roads and bridges and believe that government spending on transportation infrastructure projects is absolutely important.

However, only \$30 billion of the bill—or three percent—is for road and highway spending. And, CBO states that much of this spending will take several years to make any stimulative impact.

My constituents understand that we cannot spend our way to prosperity and that serious consequences lie ahead if Congress goes down this irresponsible borrow-and-spend path.

What the American people really need are long-term, permanent tax cuts which will impact families twice as fast as the Democrats' government spending in this bill. These tax cuts will spur job creation and help stabilize the economy over the long run.

I support much-needed, incentive-based relief for small businesses, the job-creators and the backbone of our economy, and I believe we must reduce the financial burden that the Federal Government imposes on middle-class families.

I'm a cosponsor of the Economic Recovery and Middle-Class Tax Relief Act, which is a real economic recovery plan that has NO welfare spending, NO pork-barrel spending, and NO bailouts.

This package would immediately inject private capital into our economy and at the same time, it would lay the groundwork for sustained economic growth.

It includes a permanent 5 percent across-the-board income tax cut. It increases, and makes permanent, the child tax credit to \$5,000 and makes the lower 15 percent capital gains and dividends rates permanent.

It repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax, AMT, on individuals—a punitive and outdated relic of a tax which will hit more than 30 million people in 2009.

It permanently repeals required distributions on retirement accounts and makes all withdrawals from IRAs tax- and penalty-free during 2009. And, it increases by 50 percent the tax deduction on student loans and on qualified higher education expenses.

These are just some of the key initiatives of this legislation.

We have seen the mistakes of tax-and-spend government policies in the past and know that they will not lead to long-term economic growth and recovery.

We must implement real, permanent tax relief for American families and stop this Washington spending spree that will burden many generations to come.

□ 2000

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this spending bill that is before us.

I spent 12 hours in the Energy and Commerce Committee where we marked up our portion of this legislation, and I think there were some real amazing things in this bill that maybe some people on this floor don't know about. I was going to ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) about it because she mentioned insurance. In here is a provision for the taxpayers in my district who are still working to support insurance payments up to 65 percent for those who may lose their jobs.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we passed an amendment in a bipartisan way to say that millionaires who made a million bucks last year, you don't have to have my taxpayers support your COBRA payments. Unfortunately, somewhere along the mystical way that this bill came to the floor, that bipartisan amendment got stripped out. So now you could be Madoff, I suppose, and get your COBRA paid for.

There is a recoupling provision in here on energy that I think is one of the most perverse things I have ever heard of; that if my constituents invest in energy conservation in their homes to reduce their energy consumption, which is good for the environment and good for their wallets, if you vote for this, you are going to vote to say the utility companies can raise their rates to make up the lost revenue. So this puts utility company revenues ahead of consumers in States, Massachusetts, Oregon, the other 48 States and the territories. You are going to encourage them on the one hand to conserve on energy, and on the other hand you are going to grant this new authority so the utility companies can raise their electricity or gas rates.

This is an enormous borrowing bill. This is making the Federal Government the next subprime lender. Why else is it for the first time I believe in our country's history there is now an insurance product available on U.S. securities? Why? Because people are starting around the world to say we are not so sure about America.

I am trying to figure out, and maybe the gentleman on the other side of the aisle can answer, who is going to loan us this money? Have we ever gone to the market for \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion?

The CHAIR. The Chair understands the gentleman from Michigan is the remaining speaker on this side. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the right to close.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, we have one remaining speaker in addition to myself.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have two remaining speakers on this side.

First, I would like to redesignate the time previously allocated to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) of the Education and Labor Committee, 2 minutes.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. This legislation is necessary to rebuild our economy. Like other States, my State of New Hampshire has been hit hard by the Nation's economic crisis. Our unemployment rate has risen, foreclosures have increased, and the State is facing a very serious budget shortfall.

Over the past few weeks, I have traveled throughout my district talking to local officials, business owners, and other constituents. In each meeting I have attended, the main theme is the same: infrastructure and jobs, infrastructure and jobs.

In Dover, we talked about the need to replace some of the water and sewer piping of a system that has been in existence since the late 19th century.

In Portsmouth, we discovered the need to invest in the water treatment plant to guarantee safe drinking water into the future.

In Manchester, the largest city in New Hampshire, I heard from the board

of aldermen about the crucial need for transportation funding.

In North Conway, I heard from town officials whose projects were not only necessary for public safety, but were forward-thinking, incorporating green energy technology.

The infrastructure investments in this bill are essential for the current and future health of our economy. We cannot fund every worthy project, but we will create and save jobs in New Hampshire and across the Nation.

I am very hopeful that these funds, like the investment that was made in Dover more than a century ago, will be used to make investments and infrastructure improvements that will leave real, meaningful and lasting results for our communities. After all, we are borrowing money, money that future generations of Americans will have to pay back. I hope that they will be able to see tangible benefits for their money.

So many Americans families are hurting. We must not only acknowledge their pain, we must help them recover. This package will help them recover. This package will help America recover. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this enormous economic stimulus package. To put its size in perspective, one-tenth of 1 percent of the stimulus would solve Tennessee's State budget deficit.

To quote one of my favorite baseball philosophers, Yogi Berra, if you don't know where you're going, you might end up someplace else. I think with this bill we are going to end up someplace else.

We know that this spending is enormous. The question is, is it going to work? This past week the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office cast doubt on whether this is going to be effective when it said only 7 percent of the plan's infrastructure spending would be spent by the end of the first fiscal year, and only 65 percent of the total package would be spent by 2010. I as a previous mayor support infrastructure spending.

Even more troubling for taxpayers is where their money is going. We were about to spend \$50 million on the National Endowment of the Arts. Whatever one believes about spending taxpayer dollars on the arts, shouldn't we all be able to agree it should not be done when the country is facing a trillion dollar deficit and that it is not economic stimulus.

Until it was exposed, this so-called economic stimulus bill was spending millions on birth control.

People back in Tennessee are adapting to this troubling economic climate by tightening their belts and clamping down on unnecessary spending, and so they are understandably upset that the Federal Government's reaction is exactly the opposite. They are amazed that we preparing to spend an addi-

tional \$825 billion of their money after a \$700 billion bailout was spent without anybody being able to give a straight answer as to where the money went. They are skeptical of the results we are getting, and so am I. An economic stimulus project should fund projects that stimulate the economy, create jobs with long-term economic growth, not as a short-term fix.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, the American people have been paying for the Republicans' party for the last 8 years. It is time now to get back to America's middle class. I rise in support of this economic recovery plan. It is a bold plan. It creates jobs and moves to long-term growth. We must act now to help a middle class hit hard by job insecurity, stagnant wages, rising health care costs, and a financial market in crisis. We have an urgent responsibility to invest wisely, target limited resources to proven initiatives that we know will boost employment, support economic growth, and provide critical relief.

That means expanding eligibility of the child tax credit by reducing the threshold from \$12,000 to zero. Over 16 million children would benefit. It means child care, Head Start, a serious infusion of resources to No Child Left Behind, and IDEA, investing in our long-term growth so future generations can compete. There is \$40 billion for infrastructure funding, transit funding, additional billions for water, housing and school projects to put Americans back to work at a time when we are facing staggering unemployment.

We need to put the resources in the hands of people most likely to spend them quickly. There is \$100 billion in unemployment benefits and job training, \$27 billion for rural development through health care, public safety services, and an additional \$150 million for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, supporting food banks stretched thin by rising food prices and surging demands.

Anyone looking for immediate and significant impact need look no further than Food Stamps, which generate \$1.73 in new economic activity for every dollar invested.

This bill provides \$20 billion to increase the Food Stamp benefit which could reach 14 million households less than a month after the bill is enacted. Leading economists have said that increasing Food Stamps is one of the most efficient ways to prime the economy's pump, and it also helps part-time workers.

No investments are more critical than those we have to make in human capital. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, our economy is in a recession and we must act. The ques-

tion, however, is what action do we take. The President has directly challenged us to put aside partisanship and find an American solution.

I was pleased to meet with the President today and ask about including new provisions in this bill. Frankly, what we saw from the President today was a greater effort to reach out to Republicans than we have seen from the House majority.

Mr. Chairman, the American people know we cannot spend our way to prosperity. What was once an \$825 billion "stimulus" bill has now grown to be \$1.1 trillion.

The American people know that adding \$1.1 trillion to the deficit for new spending on old government programs will not create jobs. They know small businesses create jobs, not the Federal Government. And they know families can better manage their budgets than the Federal Government.

So as we go through this debate, we will point out some very simple facts about how effective Federal spending is versus tax cuts in creating real private sector job growth.

Just yesterday, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released its review of the spending in the House Democrats' proposed "economic stimulus" legislation. This CBO review confirms what Republicans have been saying all along: the Democrat package won't stimulate the economy now when it needs it most.

The primary reason is, the Democrat plan relies too heavily on slow government spending initiatives, not tax cuts to do the job. As seen in the chart next to me, even the Democrat stimulus bill proves tax cuts impact families and the economy twice as fast as government spending.

CBO went on to say reductions in Federal taxes would have most of their effects in 2009 and 2010, but purchases of good and services, either directly or in the form of grants to States and local government, would take several years to complete.

Worse yet, CBO expects that the rate of spending in 2009 would be considerably slower than historical rates of spending, and many of the larger projects initiated would take up to 5 to 7 years to complete.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Chairman: The nonpartisan CBO confirms that tax cuts get more money into the hands of American families and our economy faster than government spending. The American people know that tax cuts are a better way to stimulate the economy than borrowing money from China just to increase Federal spending and raise the Federal deficit.

If the Speaker was interested in answering the President's call to reach a bipartisan American solution to this crisis, she would work with Republicans to increase tax relief for every working American.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this has been in many ways a very sad debate. We face the prospect of economic collapse. We certainly face the worst economic crisis in our lifetime. We have been asked by the President to pass legislation that will try to put people back to work by repairing schools, by building roads, by developing modern energy grids, and by making broadband available to rural America. We have been asked to invest in science and technology to make our economy more efficient and more productive and more conducive to job growth. And we have been asked to invest money to make our health care system less costly and more efficient and more open to more people.

□ 2015

We've also been asked to provide assistance to people who have lost their jobs through unemployment insurance, and by helping them to meet the cost of education, especially college.

And we've also been asked to take actions to help stabilize State and local budgets so that while we try to expand the economy at the national level we aren't shrinking the economy at the State level through unfortunate State tax increases or service cutbacks. That's what we're trying to do.

This is serious business. And yet when you look at much of the debate that we had today, you would think that we were playing a game of Trivial Pursuit. We've had at least 10 Members of this body on the other side of the aisle focus on the really big picture by complaining about the fact that there is a \$50 million appropriation for the arts or, can you imagine, because we have the temerity to want to try to repair the Jefferson Monument to prevent the plaza on the Mall from sinking into the Tidal Basin. It is really sad, indeed.

I wonder why it's come to this. And then I recall a statement by a member of the House Republican leadership in which he advised his caucus members to deal with their minority status by behaving like a thousand mosquitos and apparently inflicting mosquito bites on the majority.

We've had a lot of Republican talk about bipartisanship, which was welcomed; but yet before President Obama even was able to appear before the Republican Caucus today we are told in newspaper stories that one of the key leaders in the Republican Caucus advised their Caucus even before the President came—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

And yet we're told that the Republican Caucus was advised to vote against this bill by one of their leaders.

I think the public will see through this. It doesn't matter much what we say to each other or how we talk to one another. It should, but apparently it doesn't. All I can say is we have a seri-

ous job before us. We have had many ideas expressed for many months, but the time for talk is over. We need to make decisions. And right now, like it or not, the only comprehensive package before us, the only balanced package before us is the one being brought to us in this bill today. And I would hope that tomorrow, when we vote on it, that there will be significant bipartisan support for that package. I don't know if I have any real expectations that will occur or not, but I would certainly like to think so.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I would like to address H. Res. 88, the rule providing for consideration of the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009" and the bill itself. I believe the H. Res. 88 can be supported by every Member of the House.

Mr. Chair, just yesterday the Associated Press reported that tens of thousands of Americans will be losing their jobs. This news was on top of the 2.6 million jobs lost last year under the old Bush Administration. Some of the biggest names in industry have announced layoffs yesterday, from Sprint Nextel, Caterpillar, Home Depot, to GM, all of these companies have announced thousands of layoffs.

Experts believe that without intervention, unemployment will rise to 8.8 percent, the highest since 1983, and it is reported that the worst business conditions in greater than 20 years will exist.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will result in infusing greater than \$850 billion into America's ailing economy. With this economic recovery plan, there will be 4 million more jobs and an unemployment rate that will be 2 percentage points lower by the end of 2010. Moreover, H. Res. 88 provides for unprecedented accountability and transparency measures that are built into the legislation to help ensure that tax dollars are spent wisely. \$550 billion is strategically targeted to priority investments; \$275 billion in targeted tax cuts will also help spur economic recovery. All of these laudable aims are achieved without earmarks. This Act represents the culmination of priorities shared with the new Obama administration and is sure to help America's economy in the long term.

AMENDMENTS

I would have offered the following four amendments to the underlying bill, H.R. 1.

AMENDMENT 1

First, I would have offered several amendments that specifically addressed the issue of funding for parklands, either rural or urban in the bill. I would have made clear that the funding in the bill in Title VIII does not preclude the use of the funding "for the restoration, creation, or maintenance of local and community parks, including urban and rural parks."

The inclusion of such language would make eminently clear the Congress's intent to work on green spaces and the creation of green jobs in a new America. This is a priority already articulated by the present Obama administration and that would be appropriately mirrored here in this legislation.

AMENDMENT 2

Second, I would have offered an amendment that allowed local parks and recreation facilities to be provided with \$125 million for construction, improvements, repair or replacement of facilities related to the revitalization of

State and local parks and recreation facilities under the Land and Water Conservation Act Stateside Assistance Program, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601(4)-(11)), except that such funds shall not be subject to the matching requirements in section 4601-89(c) of that Act:

URBAN PARKS

For construction, improvements, repair, or replacement of facilities related to the revitalization of urban parks and recreation facilities, \$100 million is made available under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), except that such funds shall not be subject to the matching requirements in section 2505(a) of the Act: Provided that the amount set aside from this appropriation pursuant to section 1106 of this Act shall not be more than 5 percent instead of the percentage specified in such section and such funds are to remain available until expended. Cities and counties meeting this criterion would have to include the required distress factors as part of their applications for funding.

AMENDMENT 3

The third amendment that I would have offered would have extended the special rule regarding contracting under this bill to all sections of the bill.

The special rule on contracting would provide that each local agency that received a grant or money under this Act shall ensure, if the agency carries out modernization, renovation, or repair through a contract, the process for any such contract ensures the maximum number of qualified bidders, including local, small, minority, women- and veteran-owned businesses, through full and open competition.

This amendment is important because it ensures that qualified bidders, including local, small, minority, women- and veteran-owned businesses, participate in the process through full and open competition. This would definitely create jobs and help these communities.

AMENDMENT 4

A fourth amendment that I would have offered would have conditioned the release of monies to the Department of Justice to prevent prosecutorial misconduct. Specifically, the language would have prevented the release of money to the Department of Justice unless the State did not fund any antidrug task forces for that fiscal year or the State had in effect State laws that ensured that:

(A) a person is not convicted of a drug offense unless the fact that a drug offense was committed, and the fact that the person that committed that offense, are each supported by separate pieces of evidence other than the eyewitness testimony of a law enforcement officer or an individual acting on behalf of a law enforcement officer; and

(B) a law enforcement officer does not participate in an anti-drug task force unless the honesty and integrity of that officer is evaluated and found to be at an appropriately high level.

While I did not formally offer these amendments, I believe that their goals are no less aspirational and that these are indeed good ideas that should be included.

OBERSTAR AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT 1

Mr. Chair, I support, and I urge my colleagues to support two amendments offered by Chairman OBERSTAR. First, I would urge my colleagues to support Chairman OBERSTAR'S

amendment that any monies appropriated under Title XII be used within 90 days or the use of such funding will be forfeited. This so-called "Use or Lose It" amendment addresses the issue of job creation and the necessity that the Nation must act fast. It is believed that with the inclusion of this language entities will act without delay for fear of forfeiting access to much needed funds. These monies are critical for the renovation and improvement of the Nation's transportation and infrastructure and must be expeditiously used to ignite our transportation system across the Nation. This infusement of capital into the Nation's transportation and infrastructure will surely create jobs for Americans.

AMENDMENT 2

Similarly, I support Chairman OBERSTAR'S amendment that would authorize \$9 billion for use for transportation and Infrastructure development, creation, and renovation in America. Frankly, I would support increasing the amount to \$12 billion because the expansion of the Nation's transportation and infrastructure is critically important to the expansion of the economy and job creation. I urge my colleagues to support this second amendment offered by Chairman OBERSTAR as well.

Mr. Chair, given the exigency of the situation and the Nation's current economic crisis, I would urge this Committee and my colleagues to move this bill quickly to the floor and act without delay. The Nation is at a crossroads and is currently sitting in its nadir, as some pundits would argue, the Nation's economy needs to be infused with capital, critical infrastructure and development, and the American people need to be employed with real jobs. H.R. 1 does this. It creates the development of infrastructure, provides Americans with jobs, and tries to correct the economy. I am hopeful that this bill will help alleviate the economic woes this country faces.

As the Obama Administration staked its campaign upon the idea of change and won, I believe that America is ready for a change. We are ready to be lifted from the doldrums of economic morass. We are ready for real change that puts America, its economy, its innovation, and entrepreneurial spirit back in its rightful place. I am hopeful and confident that H.R. 1 does just that and places America back in the spotlight as the sunbeam on the world stage. I strongly urge my colleagues to act quickly and support H. Res. 88 as vigorously as I do.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to rise in support of the package before the House today, which will help put our country on a steady path toward economic recovery.

I want to thank all of the committees that have worked to put this together, particularly the members of the Appropriations Committee and its hardworking staff. As Chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I have tried to develop proposals Members can support with confidence that they will help get our economy moving while also making us safer.

We worked diligently to scrub this bill and to make sure that the provisions that we've included would create jobs and put our economy in a stronger position for the long haul.

The bill contains \$1.1 billion in new homeland security investments. We estimate that this will not only directly create thousands of jobs, but will also contribute significantly to im-

proving both security and efficiency at our ports of entry and airports. This funding will primarily accelerate critical investments that the House has repeatedly voted for.

The recovery package contains \$500 million to buy and install Aviation Explosive Detection Systems and checkpoint screening systems in the Nation's airports, improving security while helping speed the flow of travelers through airports. A more efficient transportation system will help grease the skids of our Nation's commerce. Funds will be competitively awarded based on security risk.

\$150 million is provided to replace and repair Customs and Border Protection-owned land ports of entry at the top 10 facilities. This will improve border security, facilitate travel and trade, and reduce wait times. Once again, it will stimulate commerce by improving the transport of goods.

The package also includes \$150 million to enable the Coast Guard to alter or remove hazardous bridges and make marine navigation safer and more efficient.

\$100 million is provided for non-intrusive inspection devices to enhance security at seaports. These new devices will replace aging cargo scanning systems to ensure that our security requirements do not interrupt the flow of commerce.

Lastly, this recovery package extends aid to those hit hardest by the recent economic crisis through FEMA's Emergency Food and Shelter Program. \$200 million is included to help local community organizations provide food, shelter, and support services to the Nation's hungry, homeless, and people in economic crisis. This will provide, among other things, 1-month utility payments to prevent service cut-off, and 1-month rent or mortgage assistance to prevent evictions or to help people leave shelters. Funds will be distributed by formula based on unemployment and poverty rates.

This funding has been carefully reviewed to ensure it will help the most vulnerable among us, will create new jobs, can be obligated quickly, will make our country safer, and will help improve economic efficiency. I urge members to support these homeland security investments and to vote for this economic recovery package.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is a critical first step to beginning what will be a long process of recovering from our current economic crisis, the likes of which we have not seen since the Depression of the 1930s. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

Our Nation has already lost 2 million jobs in the current recession, and is expected to lose another 3–5 million in the coming year. The bill before us targets priority investments in infrastructure, education, health care, and energy in an effort to forestall those job losses by creating or saving 3–4 million jobs.

While the need for this economic stimulus package is urgent, clear, and compelling, we must also make sure that the money is spent wisely, and that waste, fraud, and mismanagement of these funds is kept to an absolute minimum. That is why this bill includes provisions that will ensure an unparalleled level of oversight, transparency, and accountability.

Over the past few years, Oversight Committee investigations have uncovered waste and theft of government dollars on an unprecedented scale. Stacks of one-hundred-dollar bills were loaded onto cargo planes with fork-

lifts and flown to Iraq—and nobody could say what happened to the money. Billions were spent on Katrina contracts, with little to show for it. When writing this bill, we worked with Chairman OBEY so waste and fraud is prevented from the beginning.

The bill will provide almost \$210 million to agency Inspectors General and \$25 million to the Government Accountability Office to ensure vigorous oversight of the programs and activities being funded through this bill. It will fund auditors and accountants, and more importantly, criminal investigators, to track the funds. The bill also creates a Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board to review management of the funds and provide early warnings of problems.

The bill requires an unprecedented level of transparency over the announcement and award of contracts and grants through a special Government Web site. Federal, State, and local officials will be required to post this information. Governors and mayors will have to certify that any investments funded with recovery act dollars are an appropriate use of tax dollars. It is often said that sunshine is the best disinfectant. This bill puts that sentiment to work in an extraordinarily rigorous way.

In addition, the bill makes clear that Federal contracts awarded using recovery act dollars must comply with the Federal acquisition regulation and that fixed-price, competitively awarded contracts are used to the greatest extent possible. This will ensure that the taxpayer gets the best bang for the buck.

Contractors and other non-Federal employees are also afforded whistleblower protections under this bill. This is critical, since they are often our first line of defense against wasteful spending.

Mr. Chair, this bill is essential to jump-starting our economy and providing sustained growth. But it does so in a way which will ensure unprecedented accountability and transparency. I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, there is a crisis of confidence in our country. Much of it related to the meltdown that has occurred within the financial system.

But there is also an uncertainty on the part of everyday people across this country about whether they will be able to maintain the basics in their lives. They wonder if the bottom is going to fall out from beneath their families.

People are worried about their jobs and whether they will be able to meet the mortgage payment. This bill contains funds to create jobs by building roads, sewers, a new electric grid and other needed infrastructure. It also contains a tax cut for 95 percent of working Americans.

People are worried about whether they'll have health insurance for themselves and their families. This bill provides a 65 percent subsidy for COBRA health care coverage for unemployed workers. There is another provision that will allow people to qualify temporarily for Medicaid until they find another job or alternative health care. It is estimated that these two provisions will provide health insurance to more than 8 million people.

They are worried about the cutbacks they see happening in education and how it will affect their kids. And they wonder if they will be able to send their children to college. This bill contains funding for States and school districts to prevent deep cuts in critical education programs and modernize and repair schools. The

bill also boosts Pell grants by \$500 to make college more affordable.

As much as anything, people are wondering whether the Federal Government is going to take action to help them—or will the old political divisions keep this Congress from taking effective action to help people in their daily lives.

By passing this bill, we show that we will step up to the plate and help address these concerns. This bill is a first step. Other steps will be needed, but this recovery package is a good beginning. Vote for the bill.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

With unemployment at its highest level in nearly 30 years, millions of American are struggling to pay for basic necessities as food, housing and health care, it is clear Congress must act.

In my district, our manufacturers have been hit hard by the crisis in the auto industry; our tourism economy has taken a beating as fewer Americans can afford to take a vacation; mining and forestry are suffering as the demand and price for raw materials has plummeted.

Unemployment ranges from the national average of 7.2 percent in Menominee County to 19 percent in Mackinac County. The Congress must act.

This legislation is not perfect; it is not everything I would put into an economic recovery legislation. Still, the Congress must act and act without delay!

My staff and I have been contacted by dozens of local officials from across Northern Michigan who have identified more than \$360 million in road, bridge, water infrastructure and construction projects that could help jump start their local economies.

I expect only a portion of these projects may be funded—but Congress must act.

While I have reservations about this legislation, Congress must act to invest in the Americans who need a helping hand, not a hand out.

Michigan's unemployment rate is at 10.6 percent. We must act to extend unemployment benefits to help 3.5 million Americans who have exhausted their benefits.

We must act to increase food stamps to help 31 million Americans, half of whom are children.

We must act to protect health insurance coverage for Americans who have lost their jobs and are one illness or sickness away from bankruptcy.

Mr. Chair, this bill is not perfect. But the needs of the millions of Americans struggling through this deep recession demands the U.S. Congress to act. We must act. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chair, I support the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the important first step it takes toward reinvigorating our faltering economy. The bill invests critical dollars in nearly all major industries and will create more than 4 million jobs by the fourth quarter of 2010.

Over 300,000 jobs will be saved in Florida alone, reducing unemployment by 2.4%.

The \$102 billion investment in increased income support will go to those families who are feeling the strains of financial pressure the most, providing increases in unemployment benefits, food stamps and COBRA healthcare.

Floridians can expect to see over \$29.8 million directed to Head Start, over \$105 million directed to child care and development block grants, over \$13 million for low-income energy assistance, over \$15 million for elderly nutrition programs, and nearly \$9 million aimed for preventative health services.

This will help us ensure that those who have fallen with the economy won't be beaten down, but are given the protection and help they need to get back up.

I am proud the bill provides \$211 billion in aid to state and local governments for vital services such as public education and law enforcement.

My own state of Florida is grappling with significant fiscal problems, due in large part to our foreclosure crisis, which has resulted in shrinking tax revenue, declining property values and slow retail sales.

I know that this federal aid to state and local governments will help fill in the gaps, ensuring our children get the educational support they need to compete on the global market. The bill provides over \$654 million for grades K–12 and over \$306 million for higher education institutions to modernize, maintain and repair their facilities in Florida.

The inclusion of the repeal of the 3% tax withholding on payments made to vendors by government entities will also help stimulate our economy, relieving small business and local governments from this unfair and burdensome requirement. Tax cuts in the stimulus plan will help those with the lowest incomes save more of their hard earned dollars.

In Florida this means those from the lowest end of the scale to those with middle incomes will see their taxes cut by more than 20% in 2009.

I am also pleased that the bill uses this opportunity to look forward, investing in clean and renewable energy and green infrastructure, to create jobs, reduce pollution and help to bring us to a clean energy future.

Mr. Chair, I support this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to state for the record the intent of the legislative language in the Special Rules section H.R. 1—American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Title V—Medicaid Provisions, Section 5001, subsection (f) STATE INELIGIBILITY AND LIMITATION.

The intent of this language is to ensure that states which had laws directing reduced eligibility in their state plan or waiver on or before July 1, 2008, not be deemed ineligible to receive the increased FMAP that this bill provides, due to subsequent delays when implementing those provisions. It was the case in Rhode Island that as of July 1, 2008, state law directed and authorized the reduction of eligibility in one group of beneficiaries. These provisions were not finalized and fully effective until October 1, 2008 due to a delay in the implementation of a new extension period for the waiver. The language in this special rule allows states which encountered similar delays to remain eligible for an enhanced FMAP in this Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairmen WAXMAN, OBEY and RANGEL, for their leadership and to thank all of the Ranking Members, Committee Members and Staff for this successful effort to bring the American Recovery and Reinvestment act of 2009 to the floor today so that we may deliver

it on schedule to the President's desk. This bill, H.R. 1, will not only stimulate our economy, but will also do much to heal our Nation.

As our president has promised, this bill provides an immediate investment that will create jobs, but also does so with a look to the future so that the jobs created, the infrastructure built, the stronger healthcare system created, the technology that is expanded and the training and education that is improved, not only provides jobs for today but also those we need tomorrow. H.R. 1 will lay a strong foundation upon which to create a more stable and vital economy and will actually create savings in the future.

I am proud to support this bill for the very reason some on purely political reasons oppose it.

I support it because it begins to move our country in a new and better direction—one which once again supports children and working families and begins to lift Americans out of poverty and to expand access to quality, comprehensive and culturally and linguistically appropriate healthcare to everyone regardless of race, ethnicity, gender or geography.

As a physician and as the Chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, I am pleased that this legislation makes the sound and much-needed health and health care investments that many of us have been fighting for over the past eight years.

This bill not only invests needed resources into Medicaid, with increases for the Territories, it extends the period of COBRA coverage to help Americans who have lost their jobs keep their health care coverage and increases FMAP to bolster state economic recovery efforts, but it also begins to modernize our health care system through the widespread implementation of health information technology.

In H.R. 1 we finally begin to make prevention the priority it needs to be—with 3 billion dollars going into a prevention and wellness fund, 1.5 billion dollars going into modernizing and expanding health care services in community health centers and we finally invest in the diversification and expansion of our Nation's health workforce, increasing the number of primary care physicians, nurses and other health care personnel.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1.

And while I'm at it, I want to express my understanding that apparently an ice storm is on the way, and I appreciate the cooperation we've had from both sides of the aisle in ending this debate a mite early so that people can get to their homes before the ice storm hits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

DTV DELAY ACT

Mr. BOUCHER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 328) to postpone the DTV transition date, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DTV Delay Act".

SEC. 2. POSTPONEMENT OF DTV TRANSITION DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3002(b) of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005 (47 U.S.C. 309 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "February 18, 2009;" in paragraph (1) and inserting "June 13, 2009;"; and

(2) by striking "February 18, 2009," in paragraph (2) and inserting "that date".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3008(a)(1) of that Act (47 U.S.C. 309 note) is amended by striking "February 17, 2009," and inserting "June 12, 2009."

(2) Section 309(j)(14)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(14)(A)) is amended by striking "February 17, 2009," and inserting "June 12, 2009."

(3) Section 337(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(e)(1)) is amended by striking "February 17, 2009," and inserting "June 12, 2009."

(c) LICENSE TERMS.—

(1) EXTENSION.—The Federal Communications Commission shall extend the terms of the licenses for the recovered spectrum, including the license period and construction requirements associated with those licenses, for a 116-day period.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "recovered spectrum" means—

(A) the recovered analog spectrum, as such term is defined in section 309(j)(15)(C)(vi) of the Communications Act of 1934; and

(B) the spectrum excluded from the definition of recovered analog spectrum by subclauses (I) and (II) of such section.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF DIGITAL-TO-ANALOG CONVERTER BOX PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF COUPON PROGRAM.—Section 3005(c)(1)(A) of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005 (47 U.S.C. 309 note) is amended by striking "March 31, 2009," and inserting "July 31, 2009,".

(b) TREATMENT OF EXPIRED COUPONS.—Section 3005(c)(1) of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005 (47 U.S.C. 309 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) EXPIRED COUPONS.—The Assistant Secretary may issue to a household, upon request by the household, one replacement coupon for each coupon that was issued to such household and that expired without being redeemed."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3005(c)(1)(A) of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005 (47 U.S.C. 309 note) is amended by striking "receives, via the United States Postal Service," and inserting "redeems".

(d) CONDITION OF MODIFICATIONS.—The amendments made by this section shall not take effect until the enactment of additional budget authority after the date of enactment of this Act to carry out the analog-to-digital converter box program under section 3005 of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005.

SEC. 4. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) PERMISSIVE EARLY TERMINATION UNDER EXISTING REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this Act is intended to prevent a licensee of a television broadcast station from terminating the broadcasting of such station's analog television signal (and continuing to broadcast exclusively in the digital television service) prior to the date established by law under section 3002(b) of the Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005 for termination of all licenses for full-power television stations in the analog television service (as amended by section 2 of this Act) so long as such prior termination is conducted in accordance with the Federal Communications Commission's requirements in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including the flexible procedures established in the Matter of Third Periodic Review of the Commission's Rules and Policies Affecting the Conversion to Digital Television (FCC 07-228, MB Docket No. 07-91, released December 31, 2007).

(b) PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO SERVICES.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall prevent a public safety service licensee from commencing operations consistent with the terms of its license on spectrum recovered as a result of the voluntary cessation of broadcasting in the analog or digital television service pursuant to subsection (a). Any such public safety use shall be subject to the relevant Federal Communications Commission rules and regulations in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including section 90.545 of the Commission's rules (47 C.F.R. § 90.545).

(c) EXPEDITED RULEMAKING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Communications Commission and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration shall, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each adopt or revise its rules, regulations, or orders or take such other actions as may be necessary or appropriate to implement the provisions, and carry out the purposes, of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF COMMISSION AUCTION AUTHORITY.

Section 309(j)(11) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(11)) is amended by striking "2011." and inserting "2012."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation now pending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUCHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today we take a highly regrettable, but necessary, step and delay the date for the digital television transition from the currently scheduled February 17 until June 12. With this delay, and the additional funding for the program which the stimulus measure will provide, we can assure a smooth transition and avoid the disruption and the loss of television service by millions of American homes that otherwise would occur.

Yesterday, the Nielsen service that surveys and reports on television viewing in America reported that more than 6 million American households that have over-the-air dependent analog television sets are completely unprepared for the transition. Those homes will lose service if analog broadcast ends on February 17. These 6 million homes do not have cable or satellite subscriptions, they depend on the use of rabbit ears or outdoor antennas in order to receive television service delivered over the air.

More than 3 million applications for converter box coupons are currently pending at the NTIA, and the program is currently out of funds. These 3 million pending coupons, therefore, cannot be honored.

It's truly unfortunate that the situation that we now confront was completely avoidable, but previous action to avoid it simply was not taken. Many of us warned years ago, when the legislation setting the February 17 DTV transition date passed, that the \$1.34 billion set aside for the coupon program for converter boxes was not sufficient. We pointed out that there are 70 million analog television sets in service in the U.S. that are over-the-air dependent. These television sets receive their television signals through the use of rabbit ears or outdoor antennas. The \$1.34 billion finances converter boxes for less than one half that number. It simply was not realistic to assume that more than one-half of these 70 million sets would simply be discarded.

The decision was consciously made at the outset that only \$1.34 billion in revenues from the 700 megahertz auction—which itself derived more than \$20 billion in revenues—would be expended in order to ease this transition and assure

that people do have over-the-air dependent analog sets could get some assistance in purchasing converter boxes. At the time, we were requesting a higher number. We suggested that approximately \$2.3 billion was what was needed. And we now know that that number is closer to the mark of what the actual need is.

Beyond the problem of converter boxes and inadequate funding to finance the coupons for them, the call centers that the Federal Communications Commission is charged with operating under the statute in order to answer inquiries from people who have problems with the transition—connecting their converter boxes, or doing other things like adjusting their antenna in order to receive a digital signal—are today understaffed. These call centers do not have enough personnel to answer the many calls that are coming into the centers at the present time. And that call volume will only increase as the transition date approaches and occurs. They are understaffed today. They will be more understaffed unless additional resources are provided and time is provided for appropriate staffing.

And so today we have no alternative but to delay the transition date and provide in the stimulus measure the funding that should have been allocated for this program years ago. I regret the disadvantage that this delay will cause for the first responders and the public service agencies across the country that are awaiting access to portions of the 700 megahertz spectrum now occupied by analog broadcasting which will be vacated when analog broadcasting ends. These first responders have been counting on receiving that spectrum in order to have fully interoperable national communications first responder agency to first responder agency, and that is a clear need. Their portion of the spectrum now will not become available until June 12 under the terms of this bill.

But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a far greater public service concern is allowing this transition to go forward at a time when 6 million households will be completely unprepared for it. People rely upon over-the-air television in order to receive vital safety information, information about natural disasters that can affect that individual in that home; and that information is vital to enable people to prepare. Yes, we are going to delay the arrival of this spectrum by 4 months for public safety agencies. But the far greater public safety concern lies in not taking this step.

And I would note that the legislation we are proposing tonight has been endorsed by a variety of public service agencies that are saying today that it is important that this delay occur, and specifically, that is the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials—and these are the individuals directly responsible within

these first responder agencies for their communications equipment—and also the International Association of Fire Chiefs.

I also, Mr. Speaker, regret the disadvantage of this delay for the commercial wireless service providers who bought their portion of the analog spectrum for approximately \$20 billion. But I would note, Mr. Speaker, that AT&T and Verizon, the companies that purchased most of the spectrum and contributed most of that \$20 billion, have endorsed the legislation that is pending tonight and have said that this delay is appropriate.

I also regret the added cost that will be imposed on the TV broadcasters who had planned to turn off their analog transmitters on February 17 and now will incur higher than expected electricity and transmitter maintenance costs until June of this year, but at this juncture we simply have no choice.

I rise in support of the bill before the House tonight and ask Members to give their approval. The measure before us was approved last night in the Senate, and that vote was unanimous. It actually passed by unanimous consent, meaning that every Member of the Senate had an opportunity to object, and not one Senator raised an objection to this measure.

In addition to changing the transition date to June 12, the bill directs that coupons for converter boxes be sent by first class mail rather than the third class mail currently used by NTIA for delivery. The bill makes eligible for new coupons households whose previously issued coupons have expired. That's an important new provision. Many homes requested coupons some time ago and did not redeem them within their stated life.

The bill allows television stations to turn off analog broadcasts before June 12 in markets deemed by the FCC to be transition ready. And we fully anticipate that the FCC will be very flexible in applying this provision and will actually allow the transition to occur in markets prior to the 30-day period that current FCC regulations suggest the applications must pend before they're acted upon. We think a shorter time period for this would be appropriate.

□ 2030

The bill also requires NTIA to provide a monthly report to the Congress from this time forward on the progress with the coupon program.

One final word, Mr. Speaker, before I reserve the balance of my time. Another delay in the digital transition beyond the one contained in this bill tonight will simply not occur. I will strongly oppose any effort to delay the transition beyond June 12, and I strongly discourage anyone from requesting that another delay be provided. This delay is a one-time occurrence taking place for predictable but extraordinary reasons, and no additional delay will be considered in our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks on the issue, I want to extend my personal heartfelt condolences to my good friend Mr. BOUCHER, the passing of his mother.

We feel strongly for you in your loss, and our prayers are with you as you undergo that transition.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to Senate 328. It's a solution looking for a problem.

We have had on the books since 1996 a requirement that at some point in time, the United States telecommunication network in terms of television broadcast transits from analog to digital. Under the old law, that transition was supposed to occur when 85 percent of the households in America had the ability to receive a digital signal.

Three years ago in the Budget Reconciliation Act, we changed that to give a hard date of February 17, 2009. If we had not had changed the law, we would have already undergone the transition because 95 percent of America's households now can receive a digital television signal. But the legislation that we passed three years ago put a hard date to create certainty of February 17, 2009.

Now, we know that there are some problems in the transition. Until several weeks ago, we were working collectively, collaboratively with our friends in the majority to move a bill that would tweak the accounting or provide an additional \$250 million not in appropriations but in authorization for the coupon program that Mr. BOUCHER has spoken about. Then the Obama transition team, in their infinite wisdom, decided that they wanted a delay, and as far as I can tell, and I could be corrected on this, they didn't consult with any of our legislative experts on either side of the aisle in either body, the House or the Senate. They just sent up a letter or a message to the majority side that they wanted this delay, and those discussions that we had on a bipartisan basis broke down.

We could do nothing worse than to delay this date. Now, I will admit that I am pleased to note that we now know that the perfect date is June 12. I wish I had known that 3 years ago when I was chairman of the committee working on this. If I had known that June 12 was the perfect date, we might have agreed with it. But we didn't know that. So we chose February 17, which was after the Super Bowl but before the Masters and before March Madness in NCAA. That's kind of where we picked this February 17 date.

I respect totally my friend from Virginia and his facts and figures. He's one of the most well-informed Members of this body. But on the number of households that are not yet ready, the number of over-the-air households who don't have satellite and don't have

cable is less than 1 million. We think it's about 800,000. And all the other households are ready to go.

And if you're a true conservative, you could argue that there shouldn't be any coupon redemption program, that people should pay out of their pockets.

Now, I have a confession to make, Mr. Speaker. I'm one of those consumers who's not yet ready. It's not because I don't know the transition's not upon us. It's not because I don't want to be ready. It's because I just haven't got around to it. And I, quite frankly, have the means that if I need to, I can pay \$40 out of my own pocket to buy a converter box.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRIELLO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

But when we were negotiating this with our friends that were then in the minority, now in the majority 3 years ago, they felt like we should defray the cost of these converter boxes. They also felt like we shouldn't means test it so that a billionaire, if they wanted to, could get a coupon. So we've actually sent out 13½ million coupons for 14 million over-the-air households that don't have satellite or cable. My guess is that most of the households that don't have these coupons are households like me, that for whatever reason they have chosen, they don't want to burden the government, they just don't feel like they want the hassle of asking for the coupon, whatever. I guarantee you no matter when you set the date, February 17, June 12, July the 4th, Valentine's Day, there are going to be some people that aren't ready.

We need to keep this hard date. We need to defeat this bill under suspension. We need to let the February 17 date go forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Texas, the ranking member of our Energy and Commerce Committee (Mr. BARTON) for his kind remarks acknowledging the loss that my family has recently suffered. I've been away for 3 weeks. This is actually my first day back, and his kind remarks both here and in the markup session before our Energy and Commerce Committee are deeply appreciated.

I would say, in response to the gentleman's suggestion, that the real number of households that would lose television service completely if this transition occurs on February 17 is 6 million. It is not the lower number that the gentleman suggested of somewhere between, I think he said, 750,000 and 1 million. And that 6 million number is not mine. That number comes from the Nielsen service. And the Nielsen company is perhaps, well, I don't want to say the most widely respected. I don't know that for a fact. But it is a widely respected national reporting service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

It is a widely respected national reporting service that surveys television viewing habits in America. And it is based on the surveys done by the Nielsen service that, for example, television commercial rates can be set. There's that level of confidence in the reporting that Nielsen does. And Nielsen has just reported that the number of homes that are unprepared constitute fully 5.7 percent of all U.S. households; yet the actual number is 6.5 million homes, and these are homes that do not have cable or satellite connections. These homes are completely dependent on rabbit ears or outdoor antennas and receive over the air only television. These are the number of families that would lose reception if the transition takes place as scheduled in 3 weeks' time.

I don't want to delay this transition any more than the gentleman from Texas, and the last thing I wanted to be doing this week was to be here on the floor advocating a delay, but we simply have no choice. We can't permit the level of dislocation that otherwise would occur to take place.

So I do support the legislation. I think it is necessary. I think these are the best numbers that we're going to have available to us in determining how many households are truly unprepared.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Telecommunications Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished chairman, and I also give Mr. BOUCHER my condolences and sympathy on the death of his mother.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill. And I want to tell my colleagues that I had the opportunity to ask President Barack Obama a question 3 hours ago on this very debate. And I asked him, I said, Mr. President, in light of the fact that you have a stimulus package that you're pushing and you want to create more jobs, then certainly broadband and digital television and third and fourth generation wireless will do just that. And he agreed. And I said, Then why would you want to delay the transition when we have spent all this money, billions of dollars, to publicize the date? We're going to waste all this time and money, and it's going to create a hardship for the broadcasters and so many other people. We should go ahead with this transition.

He said, Well, well.

I said, Now, if it's a question of money, Secretary Gutierrez sent a letter last year indicating \$250 million would take care of anything; so it's not a question of money.

So the President said, Well, I agree with you, it's not a question of money, but it appears to be some kind of administrative or accounting problem that we need to fix.

Well, I said to the President, I said, Mr. President, we had a demonstration project in Wilmington, North Carolina, in which we had a transition, and it turns out almost 99 percent of the people were satisfied. So the demonstration project in Wilmington, North Carolina, showed that we could transition back in September in Wilmington. Surely, we can transition February 17 in the United States.

I liken this to a football stadium. Just bear with me for this metaphor, this example. Let's say you have a large stadium with 90,000 people in it, and it actually takes 92,000 people. Well, it turns out at the front door, the door is locked. By chance a nail is caught in the door, and there are 2,000 people, just 2,000 people out there that can't get into this championship game. And the coin is tossed, they're ready to go, the lights are there, the televisions are going, everybody's roaring, they're waiting for the kickoff; and suddenly they say we've got to stop the game because these very few people, maybe 1 percent, maybe 1½ percent, can't get in the stadium; so we're going to stop the whole game because of those people. And that's what we have here. That is the analogy. We're delaying legislation on a very, very small amount. And, frankly, the demonstration in Wilmington, North Carolina, showed that we are ready to go.

Mr. Obama has made it a priority to make the government work for the people. So now in his first decision in his administration and this Congress, we're saying delay, delay, delay. We're going to delay and put a placeholder on this, and then the consumer is going to have to hold off. And by delaying 115 days, we are sending, I think, the wrong message to the people who are trying to put this in place.

So if you look at the players on the field, they're ready to go. All the stakeholders are ready to go. I urge you to defeat this.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the full committee and the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2045

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I too want to congratulate Chairman Boucher on his ascension to the Telecommunications Subcommittee. We have had a great working relationship, I look forward to doing it again.

But this is bad policy, and I am sad that you are the one who has to come and try to pawn it off on the American people.

Chairman DINGELL always used to talk about the takings clause, passing litigation and then the aspect of litigation. We have auctioned spectrum off. We have got small broadcasters who have people lined up to climb the towers, to do the transition, and we are saying, stop.

I know what I have done in my district. I have been working for 8 months with public service announcements, going to senior centers, newsletters, I have done about everything a Member can do to educate my individuals.

What I did today was I asked when was income tax day enacted into law, 1955. Everyone knows April 15 is the day you pay your taxes. Guess how many people we had not pay their taxes on April 15 last year, 12 million people, advertised, historic, annual.

The reason why we have this provision is because of the 9/11 Commission, the ability for the spectrum to be released for first-line responders to develop interoperability. Woe be it to us, Mr. BARTON, woe be it to us, Chairman BOUCHER, and we have another national catastrophe in these next months and we have failed to enact interoperability and released the spectrum to first-line responders so they can communicate with each other.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself 2 minutes.

I appreciate very much the always eloquently expressed thoughts of my friend from Illinois.

Let me say in response that this legislation has been endorsed by some of the same groups that I have concern about and that the gentleman has also expressed concern about. Yes, it is true that the 700 megahertz spectrum, large portions of it, were auctioned for commercial services and purchased. The two largest purchasers of that spectrum were AT&T and Verizon, and we have endorsements from both AT&T and Verizon for the legislation delaying this transition.

It is true that other portions of the spectrum will eventually go to the first-responder community. And I am concerned about that community. We have a clear need to deploy fully interoperable telecommunications on a nationwide basis so that a fire department from one community can talk to a fire department or rescue squad or law enforcement agency from another community when they all converge on an event somewhere. Today we sadly don't have that capability, at least not fully deployed, and making the spectrum available will enable that to happen, and I am concerned about the delay.

But I would note that this delay has been endorsed for necessary and sufficient reason by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, by the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials, who are responsible for their telecommunications equipment, and by the International Association of Fire Chiefs. And so the very people about whom we are concerned have said this delay is okay.

It is the last thing that I wanted to have to do, but we literally, at this point, have no choice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I would like to include this report from the Nielsen Company indicating that 6.5 million American households will lose television service completely because they don't have cable or satellite service and are simply not ready if the transition occurs on February 17.

[From nielsenmedia.com, Jan. 22, 2009]

5.7% OF U.S. HOUSEHOLDS STILL UNPREPARED FOR THE SWITCH TO DIGITAL TELEVISION

NEW YORK, NY.—More than 6.5 million U.S. households—or 5.7 percent of all homes—are not ready for the upcoming transition to all-digital broadcasting and would be unable to receive any television programming at all if the transition occurred today. The Nielsen Company reported today. This is an improvement of more than 1.3 million homes since Nielsen reported readiness status at the end of December.

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT ARE COMPLETELY UNREADY FOR THE DIGITAL TRANSITION

	Overall	White	African-American	Hispanic	Asian	Under age 35	Over age 55
Jan. 18, 2009	5.7	4.6	9.9	9.7	6.9	8.8	4.0
Dec. 21, 2008	6.8	5.6	10.8	11.5	8.1	9.9	5.2

Source: The Nielsen Company.

Under government-mandated action, all television stations are required to switch to digital programming by February 17, 2009, which will leave viewers without a television signal unless they purchase digital television sets, connect to cable, satellite, and alternate delivery systems or purchase a converter box.

Nielsen is making these estimates available as a public service to the television industry, government policy-makers and local communities. This information is based on the same national and local television ratings samples that are used to generate national and local television ratings. To conduct the survey, Nielsen representatives observed and tabulated the actual televisions used in its samples. Because Nielsen has developed samples that reflect the total U.S. population including African American and Hispanic populations, these household characteristics in the samples can be projected to the whole country.

"Nielsen has been preparing for the transition to digital television for more than two years," said Nielsen Vice Chair Susan Whiting. "Because we recognize that accurate and reliable information on consumer behavior is essential to this transition, we've been sharing our data with clients, government leaders and the public so they could track progress to digital readiness."

"There are still millions of people who will be adversely affected because they are not ready for the digital transition. So it's critical that we provide them with the information and resources they need to stay connected with the world," said Ernest W.

Bromley, Nielsen Hispanic/Latino Advisory Council (HLAC).

"Nielsen has played a key role in reaching out to our underserved communities and helping them understand what needs to be done," said Nita Song, Nielsen Asian Pacific American Advisory Council (APAAC).

"It is imperative that we operate at an accelerated pace to educate those who are at the greatest risk of losing their television service—low-income households, large numbers of senior, minority and disabled viewers. These viewers rely on traditional television the most and can least afford to lose their television lifelines. We have a responsibility to make sure that these groups whether in our families, churches or communities are equipped and ready for this transition," said Cynthia Perkins-Roberts, Nielsen African American Advisory Council (AAAC).

LOCAL MARKET RANKINGS

Among the 56 local markets that Nielsen measures with electronic meters, the one that is least ready is Albuquerque-Santa Fe, with 12.4% of the households completely unready. The most prepared market is Hartford & New Haven, with only 1.8% of homes unready.

TABLE 2.—LEAST PREPARED LOCAL METERED MARKETS BASED ON PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS CURRENTLY UNPREPARED FOR DIGITAL CONVERSION

	Percent		
	Completely ready	Partially ready	Completely unready
National people meter sample	85.08	9.24	5.68

TABLE 2.—LEAST PREPARED LOCAL METERED MARKETS BASED ON PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS CURRENTLY UNPREPARED FOR DIGITAL CONVERSION—Continued

	Percent		
	Completely ready	Partially ready	Completely unready
Local metered samples	82.31	12.36	5.33
Albuquerque-Santa Fe	81.29	6.47	12.24
Dallas-Ft. Worth	77.39	12.40	10.21
Houston	72.63	17.42	9.95
Tulsa	76.50	13.97	9.53
Portland, OR	80.85	10.08	9.08
Salt Lake City	81.58	9.85	8.58
Memphis	73.31	18.16	8.53
Austin	80.73	10.82	8.45
Los Angeles	82.54	9.80	7.66
Sacramento-Stokton-Modesto	77.04	15.63	7.33
Phoenix (Prescott)	77.82	14.87	7.31
Jacksonville	80.89	12.09	7.02
Dayton	75.14	17.98	6.88
Greenville-Spartanburg-And	84.94	8.37	6.69
Indianapolis	72.71	20.76	6.53
Milwaukee	73.94	19.63	6.43
San Antonio	77.19	16.61	6.20
Richmond-Petersburg	77.04	16.83	6.13
San Diego	84.42	9.64	5.94
Cleveland-Akron (Canton)	81.86	12.22	5.91
Minneapolis-St. Paul	78.21	15.94	5.85
Kansas City	75.88	18.37	5.75
Seattle-Tacoma	85.18	9.16	5.67
Miami-Ft. Lauderdale	83.11	11.41	5.47
St. Louis	79.72	15.02	5.26
Cincinnati	72.62	22.17	5.21
San Francisco-Oak-San Jose	89.45	5.35	5.20
Chicago	82.00	12.82	5.18
Las Vegas	81.79	13.04	5.17
Birmingham (Ann and Tusc)	82.91	12.23	4.86
Charlotte	85.50	9.72	4.79
Denver	81.24	14.01	4.75
Louisville	80.66	14.75	4.59
Nashville	81.58	14.01	4.41
Detroit	83.18	12.42	4.40
Raleigh-Durham (Fayetteville)	80.47	15.15	4.38
New Orleans	84.14	11.51	4.35
Columbus, OH	79.64	16.08	4.29
Buffalo	86.04	9.69	4.27
Tampa-St. Pete (Sarasota)	89.47	6.39	4.14

TABLE 2.—LEAST PREPARED LOCAL METERED MARKETS
BASED ON PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS CURRENTLY
UNPREPARED FOR DIGITAL CONVERSION—Continued

	Percent		
	Completely ready	Partially ready	Completely unready
Washington, DC (Hagstwn)	81.76	14.16	4.08
Orlando-Daytona Bch-Melbrn ...	86.30	9.79	3.91
Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newpt Nws ...	79.97	16.25	3.78
Baltimore	79.91	16.34	3.75
Greensboro-H.Point-W.Salem	85.20	11.38	3.42
Knoxville	84.78	12.02	3.20
Providence-New Bedford	83.25	13.56	3.20
Oklahoma City	85.62	11.31	3.07
Pittsburgh	88.89	8.07	3.05
Ft. Myers-Naples	89.55	7.48	2.98
West Palm Beach-Ft. Pierce	90.86	6.47	2.67
New York	92.51	4.93	2.57
Boston (Manchester)	84.05	13.70	2.25
Philadelphia	87.37	10.53	2.10
Atlanta	89.66	8.31	2.02
Hartford & New Haven	87.91	10.34	1.76

Source: The Nielsen Company.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUCHER. I will be happy to yield. But to keep this absolutely proper, let me yield to myself an additional minute, and I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Thank you for yielding the time. I appreciate that.

You know, I chair the E-911 Caucus, and I have worked across in a bipartisan basis with now Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who was on the Senate side.

I would ask if the National Emergency Number Association, NENA, which is the premier association that supports first-time responders, if they provided a recommendation on this legislation—I see staff saying yes.

Mr. BOUCHER. Will the gentleman permit me just one moment, please. The answer is the association the gentleman identified has sent a communication to us endorsing this delay.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Would the gentleman include that for the record?

Mr. BOUCHER. I will be happy to include that for the record. We will collect whatever is appropriate and be happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a letter from the Fraternal Order of Police opposing this legislation.

NATIONAL

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, January 23, 2009

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND REPRESENTATIVE BOEHNER, I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to express our concerns regarding S. 328, the "DTV Delay Act," as it relates to public safety access to spectrum.

Many of the arguments being made in favor of delaying this transition were made during the consideration of the Digital Transition and Public Safety Act in 2005. This is not a new issue, and was first recognized in a public safety report issued in September 1996. In 1997, Congress granted public safety access to this portion of spectrum under Title III, Section 3004 of the Balanced Budget

Act of 1997, which directed the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to authorize broadcasters currently occupying the spectrum to remain there until 2006. Public safety access to this area of spectrum was repeatedly pushed back until the enactment of the Digital Transition and Public Safety Act in 2005, which set a hard deadline of 17 February for analog broadcasters to allow public safety access to 24 MHz of spectrum on the 700MHz band. We are concerned that the staggered transition which would result if S. 328 is signed into law may jeopardize the channels that Congress promised to law enforcement and other public safety officers more than a decade ago.

For public safety to use the spectrum they have been promised, broadcast stations must stop analog broadcasts on those channels. Broadcast stations on the adjacent channels must also stop analog broadcasts to avoid interfering with the public safety communications we are trying to enable. For all those broadcast stations to have somewhere to go, additional broadcast stations must stop their analog transmission. It is this chain of events that makes the hard deadline of 17 February 2009 the most realistic and responsible option for clearing the spectrum for public safety's use.

While S. 328 would still allow broadcasters to voluntarily transition by 17 February, subject to current FCC regulations, and allow public safety to occupy this vacated spectrum, unless all the surrounding broadcast stations also voluntarily transition, it is unlikely anyone can move. Moreover, under current FCC regulations, broadcasters generally would not be permitted to transition even voluntarily until three months before the delayed transition date, and even then the FCC has the discretion to refuse them authorization.

The American public has asked broadcasters to take difficult, time consuming, and costly steps to enable better public safety communications. These broadcasters have admirably risen to the call and say they are ready for 17 February. If this delay goes into effect, it opens the door for future delays. More than a decade of work has gone by since Congress authorized public safety communications to expand on the spectrum, and we are very close to achieving our goal. I urge you not to bring all of this progress to a halt less than thirty days from the finish line.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of the views of the more than 327,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police. Our communications are our lifeline and we need to know that they will function properly at all times. If I can provide any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

I want to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished former chairman of the Agriculture Committee and the current ranking member, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome my good friend and neighbor back to the House and offer my condolences as well regarding the passing of his mother, who I never had the opportunity to meet, but who I heard much about from my good friend, who is rightfully proud of her record as an attorney and a public office holder in his hometown of Abingdon, Virginia.

I rise, however, in opposition to the legislation that is offered today. This is of great concern to me and to the television broadcasters and emergency services personnel and others in my district. Since the decision to switch from analog to digital television, there has been a massive public awareness campaign that has been very successful in identifying February 17 as the day of transition.

This legislation, S. 328, will delay the switch, would undermine this transition and require another massive public outreach campaign to make the public aware. The American public has had almost 3 years to prepare for this transition for which entire industries have had to adapt, and the American public is ready. Forcing them to do so for what will essentially prove to be an arbitrary deadline will set a dangerous precedent that could easily lead to more delays and would likely result in an onslaught of lawsuits.

Delaying access to the 700 megahertz spectrum will unfairly prevent those entities that have been awarded access to this bandwidth from having immediate access, again, something that has been planned for several years. This is particularly troubling when considering our first responders, the very individuals that we sought to aid with this initiative in response to the communications blunder that occurred during the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Some claim that this delay will not prevent first responders from accessing this bandwidth, but that is simply not true. Television stations will have to stop broadcasting on channels that are sought for communications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I would simply ask that the remainder of my statement be made a part of the RECORD and urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Since the decision to switch from analog to digital television, there has been a massive public awareness campaign that has been very successful in identifying February 17 as the day of transition. This legislation, S. 328 will delay the switch, would undermine this recognition and require another massive outreach campaign to make the public aware.

The American public has had almost 3 years to prepare for this transition, for which entire industries have had to adapt. Forcing them to do so for what will essentially prove to be an arbitrary deadline will set a dangerous precedent that could easily lead to more delays, and will likely result in an onslaught of lawsuits.

Delaying access to the 700 MHz spectrum will unfairly prevent those entities that have been awarded access to this bandwidth from having immediate access—again something that has been planned for several years. This is particularly troubling when considering our first responders, the very individuals that we sought to aid with this initiative in response to the communications blunder that occurred during the terrorist attacks of September 11,

2001. Some claim that this delay will not prevent first responders from accessing this bandwidth, but that is simply not true. Television stations will have to stop broadcasting on channels that are sought for communications and neighboring channels will also have to be cleared to avoid interference.

Delaying the transition will also hinder the deployment of broadband, something that has also been planned for years, and will unfairly limit the companies and consumers that plan on utilizing this type of broadband access.

Furthermore, this proposed delay is being used to justify \$650 million in new spending in the proposed new economic stimulus bill. In a time of economic distress and budgetary disarray, increasing the debt to American taxpayers by hundreds of millions of dollars hardly seems prudent. In fact, this legislation will work against any effort to stimulate the economy because the economic activity and growth that comes with deploying new broadband technology and new emergency communication will be delayed.

There are some reports that nearly 93 percent of households affected by this switch are already prepared, deeming this legislation excessive and overly burdensome.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank my ranking subcommittee chairman for the time.

Let me get right at it. The 1996 law that this law replaced said that when the marketplace had 85 percent of households with one television that could receive digital, this transition could occur.

The law that we passed a couple of years ago said, no, we are going to work this a little differently. We will set a hard date, we will make coupons available to do all of this. Currently, 94.3 percent of American households have a television that receives digital or that has the ability to receive digital signal.

So remember the old law that we updated said 85 percent could make this change today, or 94 percent. Only exclusively over-the-air homes without a digital division or converter box are at risk of losing all television service. Now, again, Nielsen, the rating service, says there are 3.4 million exclusively over-the-air homes, and already we have sent 13.5 million coupons to 13.5 million of those homes, leaving 800,000 exclusively over-the-air households that have not yet received the coupons.

Approximately 600,000 of them, however, are on the waiting list. This all gets down to a couple hundred thousand people. This could simple easily be solved by simply changing the accounting rules and allowing NTIA to go ahead and send out those coupons.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include for the RECORD letters from television stations in Oregon who point out that this delay will cost them upwards of \$1 million in added energy costs at a time when they are having to lay off staff who do news coverage and other things because now they are going to

get saddled with this burden, \$500,000 to \$1 million.

JANUARY 8, 2009.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GREG, I hope this note finds you well. This letter is in reference to the possible delay of the DTV transition date for broadcasters from the scheduled date of February 17, 2009. Changing the date at this time would unravel a tremendous amount of work done by broadcasters to educate consumers about DTV, and most likely do more harm than good.

Attached find a list of issues from our Director of Engineering, Karl Sargent, related to the possible change of dates.

We hope you have success in keeping the date we have all been working towards, and please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

BOB WISE,
Vice President/General Manager,
KOBI-TV/KOTI-TV.

DELAY OF DIGITAL TRANSITION

We feel the delay of the digital transition is not in the best interests of the viewer, broadcaster, or country in general.

Delaying the transition will place doubt and uncertainty in the mind of the public. We have been diligently informing them of the positive benefits of the transition and it will now place doubt in their mind that technologically, it is not ready or up to its promises of improved TV performance.

Stations have spent a lot of money in their digital facilities, allowing the analog facilities to deteriorate. It would be more cost to the broadcasters to now have to invest money into keeping the analog transmitters operating in parallel with the digital transmitters or they have to invest in short-term capital to keep the transmitters running (i.e. KOTI driver tube failure).

Delaying the transition for months will not rectify the public not being ready for the transition. In fact, it may make it worse. The public will feel that they now have time to back off their efforts to prepare. No matter when the transition takes place there are going to be viewers who are not prepared.

We need to make this transition now and get on to other critical items the stations have to do. In our case it is the capital improvement we still need to do to our station infrastructure to convert it to full digital and HD and to complete the Sprint-Nextel project.

We don't see any positives to the transition being delayed. We have been preparing for it for 5 years.

We are very concerned that the incoming administration will change the baseline rules and specifications of the digital transition. That would be a disaster in both money and time for both the viewers and broadcasters.

JANUARY 9, 2009.

To: Congressman Greg Walden, Second District, Oregon.

Fr: Jerry Upham, General Manager, KOHD Bend.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN, I was both shocked and disappointed to hear that Congress is considering delaying the implementation of the digital transition for television stations. With so much publicity and planning for this "hard date," any change would result in huge consumer confusion, and give the indication that there really is no hard deadline. In addition, millions of consumers will feel like they were incorrectly advised—in a tough economic time—to spend money now to be able to receive their television signals.

At Chambers Communications, we've spent millions of dollars for this digital transition, and, in the case of KOHD, launched the station in 2006 with an exclusively digital signal. The decision to launch without a full power analog signal was made due to this upcoming deadline. KOHD has gone without an analog signal, and has sacrificed analog viewers during this time. If the deadline is pushed back, this will only extend the station's analog deficiency. Had we had an indication that this deadline would be extended, the company may have made a different decision with regard to an analog signal.

Please urge Congress not to extend this deadline, as both the private television sector and the public will be severely negatively affected by this decision.

Sincerely,

JERRY UPHAM,
KOHD General Manager.

JANUARY 9, 2009.

CONGRESSMAN WALDEN, thanks for including local broadcasters.

(1.) Tower lease agreements will have to be extended to continue to provide some outlying areas with analog.

(2.) We'll have to continue to operate two transmitters. (a.) Increase cost (b.) More energy consumption.

(3.) February ratings moved to March, making March non-useable.

(4.) People not ready today won't be ready in 3, 6 or 9 months unless forced to change because of the end of analog service.

(5.) All our efforts to inform the public for nothing and more confusion. If we change the date once, what's to say we don't change it again?

(6.) No credibility with the public.

(7.) Angry people who have already purchased new TVs, converter boxes or subscribed to cable or satellite adding extra expense.

I get the political road the new administration is following, but to change would only prolong the pain.

Thank you,

CHRISTOPHER T. GALLU,
General Manager,
NPG of Oregon, Inc.

JANUARY 9, 2009.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN: I strongly urge Congress to resist changing the digital transition date of February 17, 2009. Broadcasters around the country have been mandated by the FCC to provide unprecedented promotion and news coverage of this important date. Millions of Americans have responded with obtaining coupons, calling broadcasters for information and preparing for this important milestone in the broadcasting industry. To delay implementation at this late juncture will most certainly confuse the American public even further. In addition, millions of consumers will feel they were misled and incorrectly advised, during these tough economic times, to spend money now to be able to receive their television signals. In addition, this will put an extra burden on broadcasters in the form of additional power usage for transmitters and man power.

Chambers Communications has invested millions of dollars for the digital transition and countless man-hours in its implementation and preparation for the Feb. 17 cut-off. I urge you to rebuff attempts to extend the deadline at this late date.

Sincerely,

RENARD N. MAIURI,
General Manager,
KDRV/KDKF TV.

JANUARY 8, 2009.

Congressman GREG WALDEN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN, I am writing to implore you to retain the digital transition date of February 17, 2009, for which we have been planning and preparing.

At the beginning of the transition, I was not in favor of a hard shut-off deadline, preferring that the market decide when analog was no longer needed. However, now that we have committed hundreds of hours of time to prepare for this change, invested hundreds of thousands of dollars to enable us to change, and literally broadcast thousands of announcements, all focused on this date, I believe that changing would be a mistake.

The key to successful implementation of any change, including a historic change such as this one, is communication. The efforts of local broadcasters to inform the viewers have reached beyond news stories, announcements, and crawls over programming, to in-person demonstrations, community talks, and talking to callers to walk through the unique needs for their location in their individual situation.

Broadcast television is my livelihood, so I don't take this position lightly. If this transition fails, and viewers lose access to free-over-the-air-TV, it will damage our ability to broadcast to the communities we are licensed to serve. Our best chance to succeed is to stick with this heavily promoted date, and trust that we will do whatever it takes to insure that all of our viewers are not left behind in the digital age.

Sincerely,

KINGSLEY KELLEY,
General Manager,
KTLV-TV.

FEBRUARY 8, 2009.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDEN: I am deeply concerned and shocked that some in the Congress are considering delaying the nationwide DTV transition that is scheduled for February 17, 2009. I understand the concern given that the distribution of coupons has been suspended and those still wishing to receive a coupon have been put on a waiting list pending the authorization of additional funds. I urge you and other members of Congress to push for legislation that would immediately provide the necessary funds to fulfill the additional requested coupons.

This station has been planning for this DTV transition for over a year and along with my fellow broadcasters has been educating the public on this transition. Collectively the Medford market broadcast stations have run thousands of announcements regarding the transition and have also engaged in educating the public through numerous outreach activities. There will always be people that wait to the last moment or have not prepared themselves for the transition even though they know it is coming, and no delay is going to mitigate that problem.

Procedures are in place for helping the public with any problems they may incur during this transition and our engineers are ready to make the transition on February 17, 2009.

Given the amount of time we have spent educating the public that February 17, 2009 is the firm date, I believe that changing that date will cause an enormous amount of confusion and do great harm to an orderly transition.

Even if the date was changed for the transition we will not change our plans to transition on February 17, 2009.

Sincerely,

GARY D. JONES,
General Manager,
KMVU-TV.

Some of these stations, one of them is brand new, KOHD in Bend, went on air as digital only in anticipation of this date. And now this Congress apparently is going to move the date.

And then in the so-called stimulus bill we are going to borrow maybe \$600 million, maybe from the Chinese, I don't know, that the next generation will get to pay back whenever that occurs so we can send out more coupons. This is a solution looking for a problem.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, can I ask how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 6 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes.

Mr. BOUCHER. Well, I would like to yield myself 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

I will submit for the RECORD a letter from the National Emergency Number Association, which I believe is the association that the gentleman from Illinois was referring to, and the chief executive officer of this association indicates support for the delay that is proposed in the legislation tonight.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give time to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) 2 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you. The ostensible goal of this legislation is to give consumers more time to prepare for the transition. But, unfortunately, this bill will only confuse customers by changing the date, cost more money and hurt public safety.

It will not give a single television viewer the coupon off the coupon waiting list. It will jeopardize the spectrum that police and firefighters say they need. Since 9/11 we have been hearing this, as our good friend from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) has already stated. And I don't know under what circumstances the national police chiefs and fire chiefs have written, but my local people are saying exactly the opposite.

And, also, this will jeopardize the spectrum that the original DTV legislation clears for advance wireless services, perhaps our Nation's quickest and most realistic way to improve broadband deployment, stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Now, if we are going to move this date to tornado season in Nebraska, let me use this Nebraska analogy about waiting so that we are at 100 percent of people already hooked up, which seems to be our new standard here.

Let me give you this story about Tom Osborne, three-time national championship coach of the Huskers. When he decided to run for Congress after being coach for, I think, almost 30 years, and three national championships, he polled and found out that he had name ID in Nebraska of 95 percent,

meaning 5 percent of the Nebraskans had never heard of Tom Osborne. Yet, we are holding up this legislation here today because 5 percent of our Nation, although they may have the coupons in hand, have not hooked up yet.

If we are going to wait till 100 percent, we are going to come back and delay this again.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready. Nebraska is ready because of broadcasters and community groups in my district who have been preparing the population with educational efforts about this transition to digital television that have been on going for over a year now. They have worked very hard and I would like to recognize them for their efforts here on the floor.

The Nebraska Digital Television Conversion Coalition is comprised of not-for-profit organizations that have recognized the digital television conversion could be problematic for some in our society, including elderly and low income individuals. Members of this coalition include: Nebraska Educational Television, United Way of the Midlands, Nebraska Broadcasters Association, Little Brothers & Friends of the Elderly, the Nebraska Retail Federation, the Nebraska Office on Aging and my congressional office.

Mr. Speaker, please allow me to briefly describe one example of the problems my constituents will encounter if this bill becomes law. Nebraska Educational Television tells me that they will suffer both financially and technically because they will not be allowed to increase power at the six sites they have already converted to digital. At these six sites they have decommissioned the analog service and are digital only, this was done with permission from the FCC, which results in many of their viewers unable to receive the NETV signal until the power is strengthened.

My Nebraska Broadcasters Association is also opposed and I quote, "We plead with you Congressman Terry to oppose any effort to extend this date. Any change now would create an urgent need for a campaign far greater than the first to reverse the message indelibly affixed in the minds of Americans."

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the ostensible goal of the legislation is to give consumers more time to prepare for the transition, but unfortunately, this bill will confuse consumers, cost more money, and hurt public safety:

It will not move a single television viewer off the coupon waiting list.

It will jeopardize the spectrum that police and firefighters said they needed 5 years to the day before September 11, 2001. The most important telecommunications-related recommendation of the 9/11 Commission was to make spectrum available for public safety by completing the digital television transition.

And it will jeopardize the spectrum that the original DTV legislation clears for advanced wireless services, perhaps our Nation's quickest and most realistic way to improve broadband deployment, stimulate the economy, and create jobs.

The DTV coupon program is not out of money; only half of the \$1.5 billion in the coupon program has been spent on redeemed coupons. Instead of delaying the transition and spending hundreds of millions of dollars more, Congress has the opportunity to simply do what former Commerce Secretary Gutierrez suggested and modify the coupon program to allow all of those who have requested a coupon to get one.

I urge a "no" vote.

□ 2100

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman continue to reserve his time?

Mr. BOUCHER. I continue to reserve.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to one of our new members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to Senate bill 328, the DTV Delay Act. Due to the very rushed nature by which the legislation is being considered this evening, I have a number of concerns about both the policy and procedure represented within S. 328.

Basically, we are asked to vote on legislation that will have a significant impact on the telecommunications industry and our first responders without giving it proper consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Nielsen Company estimated this past November that 93 percent of homes in the United States already had one or more TVs ready for the digital television transition. This same study indicates that 83 percent of households across the country are completely prepared for this transition.

Despite the fact that the vast majority of households across the country have taken the necessary steps to be ready for DTV transition, the DTV Delay Act would sacrifice the preparation of the masses as a means to assist the very few. Delay in this transition will only cost the taxpayers, needlessly, \$750 million, at a time when we are facing a \$1.2 trillion budget.

Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Commission stated in its report that this transition should have occurred years ago to free up the lower frequency analog signals for police, firefighters, emergency personnel, and public officials. Because this transition has been years in the making, for the benefit of our brave first responders, I believe that we need to move forward in this transition as scheduled, instead of delaying it until June.

Mr. Speaker, delaying the digital television will only create more of a financial burden for American taxpayers and create further confusion among the public. For these reasons, I urge all my colleagues oppose the DTV Delay Act.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to our very newest member of the Energy and Commerce Committee on the Republican side, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this bill to delay the transfer to digital. I think if we look at what this could do for our economy, number one, we are talking about the problems that we are having in our economy right now, and we want to create good jobs. There are billions of dollars of investment that are sitting on the sidelines right now, waiting to move, waiting to create new tech-

nologies, and create good new jobs in our economy, that this delay will further hamper.

In addition to that, I think we need to be very concerned about what this means to our first responders. It was just read into the RECORD from the president of the National Fraternal Order of Police, but also what this would mean for our firefighters as they try to implement interoperable capabilities, something that we experienced after Katrina, we saw after September 11, something we need to get to. Something, again, this delay will only hurt their ability to make those changes that they want so desperately to make for the safety of our people all throughout the country.

So there are many strong reasons why we are ready to get this implementation to take place and why we should oppose any delay.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want the American people to know that the Republicans want to solve this problem. If we defeat this bill tomorrow under suspension, then hopefully we can reach across the aisle and work with our friends in the new Democrat majority to do things that actually solve the problem.

We can actually say that money that is in the Treasury that hasn't been spent on redemptions of coupons can be used to issue new coupons. We could even eliminate the coupon requirement. We could provide a small amount of additional funding.

I have a bill that I introduced this week that does most of those things. But if we need to do something differently, I pledge to the American people and my friends on the majority side that once we defeat this delay bill tomorrow, we still have time to work together on a bipartisan basis to put together a bill that does solve the problem, without delaying the hard date of February 17.

So, with all due respect, I would ask that we defeat S. 328, vote tomorrow not to suspend the rules, and then let's work together the rest of this week and next week to solve the problem. Vote "no" on S. 328.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to compliment my friend from Texas, the ranking Republican member of our Commerce Committee, Mr. BARTON; Mr. STEARNS, the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Communications, Technology and the Internet, with whom I very much look forward to working over the course of the coming 2 years, for the very cordial way in which they have handled their opposition to this measure here today. That reflects the best traditions of our committee. We sometimes disagree, but we always do so in a very agreeable manner.

That certainly has been the situation here tonight. We all have the same objective, and that is to make sure that we have a smooth digital television transition and that American households are not dislocated when the analog television broadcast ends and all of the broadcasting from that time forward is in digital.

We have one formula for doing that and my friends on the other side of the aisle have another formula for doing that. I respectfully suggest that our formula is the better way.

I did not want to be here tonight advocating a delay in this transition. The gentleman from Texas is right. That date for the transition has been a feature of our law now for a number of years. A lot of advertising has gone behind publicizing that date. Many people have been relying on that date as the date upon which the 700 megahertz spectrum that analog broadcasting will, when it stops, will make available and be delivered. There have been plans made on this. And so this is not a step we take lightly or frivolously, but when in which we think we have no choice.

There are 6.5 million households in the United States, as revealed by the best numbers we have available coming from a highly reputable and well-regarded television reporting service, that will completely lose television coverage if this transition happens on February 17. These households are unprepared. They do not have a cable or satellite connection. They rely on over-the-air television reception only.

That dislocation simply must be avoided. These homes depend upon television service for vital information. Not just entertainment, but news and information about community emergencies that typically would only reach the home by means of the broadcast media.

We have talked about the public safety community and the fact that we do not want to see a delay in their receipt of the spectrum that they intend to use for fully interoperable communication equipment. But the greater public safety concern is turning off that analog broadcast at a time when 6.5 million homes are not prepared for the transition. Denying vital public safety information to those 6.5 million homes is the greater threat.

And so the delay for that reason is necessary. That has been acknowledged by the leading associations representing the public safety community. The National Association of Chiefs of Police, the Association of Public Safety Communications officials, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, all of whom have endorsed this delay. It has been endorsed by the major recipients on the commercial side of the 700 megahertz spectrum; by AT&T, by Verizon. It has been endorsed by the networks; by ABC, NBC, and CBS.

And so among all of those who will be disadvantaged by this delay, there is a recognition that the delay is unfortunately and regrettably necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to emphasize that this is a one-time delay, and our committee simply will not entertain requests that a delay beyond the June 12 date be adopted. I would strongly oppose any further delay. The Chairman of our Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), has indicated his strong opposition to any delay beyond June 12, and we would strongly discourage anyone from suggesting that a delay beyond that date take place.

So the step we take tonight is necessary. None of us want to take it. I think it is the only approach we have before us at this moment that truly will assure that when this digital transition occurs, and that it occurs in a way that does not result in disruption for television viewing in America. I urge the passage of the measure.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support S. 328, delaying the digital television transition. It has become clear in recent days and weeks that the country simply is not ready for the transition.

For years, I have been saying that we are not providing enough resources or enough education for the public. That is why for the past two Congresses, I have introduced my Digital Television Consumer Education Act. This legislation would provide far more education about the transition, and would add \$200 million to the converter box coupon program to get coupons to the 2 million people on the waiting list.

I do want to ensure that this delay is only a one-time event. If we keep delaying and delaying, we will never see the benefit of the transition. Television viewers will not get to see crystal clear images of their favorite programs, we will not enjoy the technological advances that will be rolled out by wireless companies, and most importantly, our first responders will not get the interoperable communication devices they so desperately need. But with the condition that this will be a one-time delay, I will support S. 328.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 328, the DTV Delay Act, which passed the Senate yesterday by unanimous consent. This legislation extends the digital television transition date and makes improvements to the converter box coupon program.

In 2005, Congress mandated that as of February 17, 2009, all television stations shut off their analog broadcasts and transmit in digital only. The transition from analog to digital will offer better pictures and sound, more programming choices, and interactive capabilities. It will also serve an important public safety purpose by freeing up spectrum for first responders for nationwide interoperable communications. Finally, it will provide consumers with new and innovative commercial wireless services.

Unfortunately, we are not prepared for this transition. The prior administration assured the Committee on Energy and Commerce repeatedly that the transition effort was on track. But on December 24, 2008, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, NTIA, notified Congress that the converter box coupon program would run out of funding the first week of January and that it would need an additional \$250 to \$350 million to meet projected demand.

The President's Transition Team asked Congress to extend the deadline for a brief period. This is not a step that anyone wants to take. But we have no good alternative. Without a short, one-time extension, millions of households will lose all television reception.

The DTV converter box coupon program is supposed to ease the financial burden of the transition. But it has ground to a halt. There are currently over 1.7 million households on the waiting list. In addition, the FCC has not adequately planned for call centers and other assistance for consumers who will face technical problems after the transition has occurred.

The measure before us extends the date of the transition to June 12 and extends the coupon program date until July 31, 2009. It will also allow those who hold expired coupons—or never received their coupons because of problems with third class mail—to reapply.

Moreover, the economic recovery package that the House is considering includes \$650 million to fix the coupon program and intensify consumer education and support.

S. 328 also takes steps to lessen the impact on other affected parties, including public safety, broadcasters, and wireless licensees.

I am pleased that this bill now has broad support in the public safety community, including the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, APCO, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, IACP, the International Association of Fire Chiefs of Police, IAFC, and the National Emergency Number Association, NENA. It has the support of the two biggest winners of spectrum that will be vacated as a result of the DTV transition—AT&T and Verizon. And, it has the support of a number of public interest groups.

S. 328 gives the new administration the resources it has told us it needs to fix the coupon program and better prepare consumers for the transition.

Unfortunately, our time to act on the legislation is short. If we do not pass this measure, it is likely that there will be no extension of the February 17 transition. Time will have run out for the administration to implement the changes necessary to fix the problems.

I urge Members to support this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to address the urgent problems occurring with the digital television transition.

After participating in numerous oversight hearings by the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee on the DTV transition in the 110th Congress, and seeing the mismanagement of the transition by the previous administration, we need time to get this right and correct the problems left for the Obama administration.

I am supporting this legislation, not because I think moving the transition date back is a good idea, but because when the National Telecommunications and Information Administration notified the Committee late last year that they would run out of money in the coupon program, postponing the date to get every household the coupons they need became necessary.

Our office sent out the coupon application in our constituent newsletters, handed them out at our townhall meetings, and took them to other events in our district to distribute. For their part, broadcasters, cable, and satellite

television spent millions in advertising to educate the public about the upcoming transition.

The primary reason we have to delay this transition is due to the mismanagement of the program by the NTIA—after months of asking questions in hearings and letters to the Administration, members of the Telcom Subcommittee were assured there was plenty of money to finance the program and provide every household that needed one a converter box coupon. On December 24, however, the Energy and Commerce Committee finally received word from NTIA that the program would run out of money, much too late for Congress to address the problem, and now there are over 2 million households on the coupon waiting list.

As expected, more problems are also surfacing as we have gotten closer to the transition. Last week the Washington Post ran an article about problems people are experiencing with their antennas, and in my hometown of Houston, we have continually raised the issue of there being limited options and availability of battery-powered converter boxes for households to purchase in the event of a hurricane like we experienced last September with Hurricane Ike. Currently, households must buy a separate battery-pack for a converter, and the coupon program does not cover the battery-pack.

I understand getting the coupon program rolling again is the most pressing matter, but I hope between now and June 13 we can address these other issues and create a program that will assist households who need to do more than just hook up a converter box to acquire the equipment they need to make the transition.

Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation so we can get the households the coupons they need to purchase converter boxes to keep their analog televisions from going black, and to address other issues that are arising with the digital transition.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 328, DTV Delay Act. With the deadline of February 17, 2009 for DTV transition quickly approaching, it is very important that we recognize and address the reality that consumers are still confused by this transition and in many jurisdictions are not prepared for the transition to digital television. Unfortunately, the number of people who stand to lose their access to TV programming in the DTV transition is considerable. Approximately 30 to 40 million people still rely on over-the-air television, most of who are senior citizens, poor or non-English speakers and underserved communities. Although there has been a considerable amount of outreach, it has still been haphazard. There are still issues that may make the impending deadline unrealistic.

For example, in my district—the U.S. Virgin Islands—I have heard numerous complaints about the receipt of the vouchers via U.S. Postal Service, which in my district takes much longer than most areas in the U.S. mainland. Unfortunately, S. 328 did not include the House provision to require first class mail service for the delivery of coupons via the U.S. Postal Service. This provision would have made a big difference in expediting the mail delivery time to the U.S. territories. I hope that NTIA will work on resolving this issue, although it is not a provision in the bill.

There are other components of the bill that can potentially make it a smooth transition. Although an extension will cause delays, it is important that we protect our Nation's consumers and ensure that no one is left behind in this transition. The DTV transition is not something that is easily understood by all consumers and it has become evident that it will take more time to bring everyone on board. We must work to ensure that this important transition does not leave millions of consumers in the dark.

In the interest of time, I urge passage of this legislation but encourage the NTIA to continue work with Congress on resolving the program's deficiencies.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I speak in strong support of S. 328, and I also want to thank my colleague Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER for authoring this insightful resolution.

The digital television transition is an unnecessary burden to be passed onto the American people at a time when the pressures of day to day life are heavy and growing.

To assist consumers through the conversion, the Department of Commerce through its National Telecommunications and Information Administration, NTIA, division handled requests from households for up to two \$40 coupons for digital-to-analog converter boxes beginning January 1, 2008 via a toll free number or a Web site.

However, the Commerce Department has run out of funds to cover the cost of coupons and there are millions of Americans who have yet to receive the boxes. These Americans should not be expected to purchase the converter box without the aid of the government, seeing as the entire Nation is under extraordinary economic pressure caused by the recession.

Last week, President Obama's team joined a chorus of concerned voices requesting a delay because the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, NTIA, which is to provide education and \$40 vouchers for people to buy digital TV converter boxes, ran out of money on January 4. There is also concern that many people, especially poorer and more rural areas, have not yet heard that they will need a converter and a larger antenna.

Older homes can not be easily wired for cable. The house walls might be made of concrete, brick, or stone that is difficult to wire through. This has caused some local residents to opt for analog over-the-air TV instead of cable or FIOS. Other people have decided to only wire their living room, and still use analog over-the-air in other rooms. The old construction can also cause problems running an antenna to a window, roof, or attic. These older homes are generally owned by lower income families that are being hit particularly hard by the current economic recession.

On January 22, the Nielsen Company said 6.5 million Americans had not prepared for the switch, a startling number considering the Commerce Department's inability to assist these Americans in the purchase of the converter boxes. TV stations would face extra expenses, which is a burden that they also cannot be expected to take on in times like these.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the long-term effects of this transition will benefit the American people and support the eventual transition. Mr. Speaker we are in a recession at

best. Our seniors can barely afford their prescriptions and we are asking them to pay another 40–50 dollars for a converter box? To some of us that may not seem like much but for many it is a small fortune. Especially for our senior population who may have only the television as company.

I ask that my colleagues support this legislation and give Americans more time to properly prepare for the conversion.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it infuriates me that thanks largely to the incompetence of the Bush Administration during the past three years, we are presently confronted by the need to delay the transition from analog to digital television. That we are today voting on DTV delay legislation underscores the utter folly of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration's arrogant confidence in its management of programs to carry out the mandates of the Digital Transition and Public Safety Act of 2005.

As the Obama-Biden Transition Team highlighted in its January 8, 2009, letter to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the inadequacy of the existing converter box coupon program and other federal programs meant to support consumers necessitates a delay in the date of transition to digital television. During numerous hearings in the 110th Congress, I asked representatives of NTIA whether they had sufficient funding for the DTV converter box coupon program. These representatives consistently responded that they did, even in light of a GAO report last year that NTIA would be unprepared to cope with a surge in consumer demand for converter coupons. We now know that there are some 1.5 million households on a waiting list to receive converter coupons and moreover that consumers, who apply for a coupon today, may not actually receive the coupon until after the DTV transition, as it is presently scheduled. I can only stress that had NTIA been more forthright with the Congress about the perilous reality of the coupon program, we would have been able to agree upon a solution well in advance of the consumer crisis that now looms before us.

While I intend to vote in favor of S. 328, I wish to take this opportunity to mention three brief, but important, points. First, I am troubled that S. 328 does not contain a provision to require monthly reports by NTIA concerning its administration of the DTV converter box coupon program. Given NTIA's poor administration of this program in the past, I feel it only prudent that NTIA be subject to more rigorous oversight in the future. I would add that the House version of this bill, which was to have been considered today by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, included such a reporting requirement.

Second, I would caution my colleagues that this bill's extension of the Federal Communications Commission's ability to auction spectrum gives rise to the possibility of waste, fraud, and abuse in those proceedings. I intend to work with the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to see that oversight hearings are held following the enactment of this bill to ensure that the FCC is adhering to the statutory requirements of section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, which specifies how the FCC shall grant licenses for the use of spectrum.

Finally, I am concerned about the DTV transition's effect on the natural environment, spe-

cifically as millions of analog television sets are disposed of by consumers. These old television sets contain such hazardous materials as mercury, chromium, cadmium, and beryllium, which could leach into the ground after these sets are deposited in landfills. I hope also to work with the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to examine the environmental repercussions of the DTV transition and take such steps as necessary to mitigate them.

In closing, I remain committed to working with my colleagues in reaching a consensus-based solution to the problems associated with the DTV transition, especially to mitigate its impact on low-income, rural, and elderly Americans.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 328, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. POLIS of Colorado (during debate on S. 328), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-9) on the resolution (H. Res. 92) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CALVERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DUNCAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2006, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY. It is my privilege this evening to have the opportunity to be-

half of our leadership to take this hour and talk about a number of things, particularly to discuss this economic stimulus package that we are going to be voting on very soon, probably tomorrow. And we will get into that, and hopefully some of my colleagues will join me on the floor.

But, before I begin that discussion, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take an opportunity to rise and to recognize a great woman who I am blessed to call Aunt Eleanor on her 95th birthday. Eleanor Gingrey Murphy turned 95 years old today, Tuesday, January 27, 2009.

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend her birthday celebration, but I wanted to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to honor Aunt Eleanor and wish her a happy and a healthy birthday. Eleanor Gingrey Murphy has lived a great life and has been a blessing to both her family and to her community.

□ 2115

She was born on January 27, 1914, to Charlie and Effie Eubanks Gingrey, my grandparents, in Warrenton, South Carolina, just outside of my hometown of Augusta, Georgia. At the time of her birth, she had two older brothers, Bill and my father James Gingrey. About 2 years after her birth, her youngest brother Charles was born.

Just before Aunt Eleanor's fourth birthday, her mom died in childbirth at age 26. My grandfather, Charlie, worked hard as a mail carrier and later as a carpenter to provide for his four children. But times were tough, Mr. Speaker, and the children often had to take care of each other when aunts and uncles were not available. After school, they often roamed the woods, learning the names of wild berries and fruits that were edible, and they would collect them and bring them home for food. Eleanor was left to do all the cooking for the family at an early age; and she must have learned well, for she is a wonderful cook today.

After high school, Eleanor followed her brothers to New York, where they had hitchhiked in their mid teens to search for work. While in the Big Apple, she met Bill Murphy. Bill Murphy, an Irish immigrant who immigrated legally to the United States with his family from Limerick, Ireland. Eleanor and Bill fell in love and were married in 1937 at the St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church in New York City. They had both been working at a little restaurant, Mr. Speaker. Some of my New York colleagues may remember it; I think it was called the Horn and Heart, where you put a little coin in a slot and you could see your food and you pull out a sandwich or a salad or a bowl of soup.

Well, they were blessed with five sons, my cousins, Larry, Billy, Charles, Tom, and Kenneth. Shortly after the birth of their second son, Billy, Eleanor and Bill left New York City, and they settled their family in a little town called Edgefield, South Carolina.

Tragically, my Uncle Bill left this world at the age of 44 after suffering a

heart attack while supervising a sandlot baseball game that he had organized among his own sons and the African American neighbors. Once again, Aunt Eleanor was left to care for her family. Her boys were now becoming teenagers. At the time of my uncle's death their ages, Mr. Speaker, were 12, 13, 16, 17, and 19. And, believe me, times were not easy. Eleanor enrolled in nursing school, and she earned her LPN in order to support her family. Her oldest son Larry had to cut short his Navy enlistment to help out at home.

Through the years, Eleanor's family has continued to grow with her love and her support. She now has 12 grandchildren, and 20, and I understand soon to be 21, great grandchildren. Aunt Eleanor is a devout Christian woman who has a deep love for her family. She often remarks how blessed she has been to be able to watch her children become old men. Fortunately, that includes her nephews and niece, of which I am a proud member.

Eleanor Murphy is a remarkable, remarkable woman with a generous and a loving spirit, and I ask all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me tonight in wishing my aunt, Eleanor Margarite Gingrey Murphy, a happy and a blessed 95th birthday. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to take the first part of this hour to discuss this wonderful, wonderful woman and to pay my respects to her.

Mr. Speaker, this is quite a week. We are going to be voting tomorrow on a bill that would spend \$825 billion to stimulate our economy. I know that we all agree, both Republicans and Democrats, in this body and 100 Senators in the other body, that these are dire economic times. This country is in a deep recession, and something truly needs to be done about it. We need to stimulate the economy, we need to grow jobs, we need to free up credit markets, and we need to do it quickly.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that this package is not the right package. Sure, there are some tax cuts in the package and there are some spending programs; but when this was first described, the idea was there would be monies spent for infrastructure projects all across this country, restoration of roads and bridges, money spent on rapid transit and repairing decaying infrastructure. And each State was asked to prepare a list of projects, and States including my own of Georgia laboriously went through this process to find projects, so-called spade or shovel ready projects that we could immediately get started or purchasing right away and getting these projects underway and putting people back to work. And it was an estimate that several hundred billion dollars would be spent on the these projects.

But as this program has developed, and we now today at the 11th hour looking at this bill as it has been marked up on the House side, what we see is far different from what was originally projected. It is not unlike what

happened before the first of the year back at the end of the 110th Congress when Secretary Treasury Paulson came to the Congress, to both the House and the Senate, and said: Look, the sky is falling; we are in dire economic straits. And I have a plan; it is just three pages long, but I have a plan. And I am going to ask you to authorize me to spend \$800 billion to purchase something that was referred to, Mr. Speaker, as troubled assets, so the program became known as the TARP program, Troubled Asset Relief Program.

And I am not going to try to get too deep into the weeds of all of this, but the bottom line is that many financial institutions across the country were holding literally 50, 75, in some cases hundreds of billions of dollars worth of these collateralized, securitized mortgages, many of which contained subprime loans that had questionable value, particularly with the value of homes going down, and sometimes the mortgage alone on these homes was worth far more than the value of the home that they represented. But in any regard, that is what the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said to us, and that we needed to give them that authority to do it, and to do it quickly.

So, basically, over my vote and many on my side of the aisle, this bill did pass, and \$350 billion was spent and spent quickly. But, Mr. Speaker, to this day I don't believe one thin dime has been used to purchase a troubled asset. No. The Secretary of the Treasury, former Secretary of the Treasury made a decision that maybe the British had a better plan, one that was not discussed with us at any time, at any time, as we deliberated and debated that bill. And we finally made some changes to it, and it went from a three-page bill to a 110-page bill, and at no time was there any discussion though of taking that money and literally giving it to the large national banks and regional banks to restore their capital and to purchase stock in these banks, preferred stock, and so the government would literally take an ownership interest in our banking system.

So that is basically what happened. No troubled assets were purchased. And what happened to the credit markets and the ability for a small business man or woman to get a loan from a bank, or indeed a person to get an automobile loan or someone to borrow a little money to send their child to college or get them through that last semester? That money was frozen. There was nothing available. And so this program, to my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, hasn't worked at all. And it is pretty depressing when it was not even something that we in this Congress had talked about. This was just a decision that was made because the Secretary of the Treasury said: Well, there is some fine print or a section in the bill that says I have the authority to do this. And he did it.

And so now as we come back for the 111th, and just before President Obama

was sworn in for his inauguration on January 20th, former President Bush asked for the rest of the money, so to speak, another \$350 billion; and yet, again, no real restrictions on how that money was going to be spent, and no accountability, no transparency. And so we on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, have some real concerns about what we are doing to this country and the amount of money we are spending.

Now, talking about the TARP program, that is a total of \$800 billion. And now we are on the eve, literally, of passing another piece of legislation where we spend \$825 billion, but some say it will end up being \$1.5 trillion, or possibly even more, on a massive spending program that is a far cry from what we were originally told; that is, most of this money would be put immediately to work on spade ready or shovel ready infrastructure projects across this country repairing roads and bridges and some for mass transit. And when we look at the content of the bill and we see things like hundreds of millions of dollars to resod the National Mall and several hundred million dollars for a contraception program, to me, that has very, very little, if anything, Mr. Speaker, to do with stimulating the economy. It just simply does not.

Fortunately, and I commend President Obama for this, there are some tax cuts in this economic stimulus package. But some \$80 billion of \$250 billion of tax cuts are literally going to people, Mr. Speaker, who currently are not paying any Federal withholding tax. They have no obligation to, because with their income and the amount of deductions, then they don't owe any Federal income tax but they do pay a payroll tax. So this is a refundable tax credit for those individuals, and it amounts to, as I say, approaching \$70 billion. And it is really taking money out of the Social Security system and the Medicare system that benefits that group of people more than any other in our population.

A little lesson on Social Security, Mr. Speaker, is that individuals who are eligible for Social Security, who are in the lower income levels, their monthly check on Social Security replaces far more of their income than the monthly check to someone who is a higher income earner. Someone at a higher income level may get 15 percent or less of their income replaced by Social Security; but individuals at that lower income level who pay no withholding tax, their income replacement by Social Security is up to 40 or 45 percent.

□ 2130

And so to literally take that money and take it out of the Social Security system, to me it seems like it penalizes them more than it helps them. That is something that hasn't really been discussed. I haven't heard others discuss it, Mr. Speaker. But maybe we will

hear more about that tonight from some of my other colleagues.

There is one most important point that I would like to make. And of course, President Obama very respectfully came to the Republican Conference today. I think he was very forthright with us. I think most, all of my colleagues on the Republican side would agree that the exchange was respectful, sincere and honest. There were honest differences of opinion in regard to what kind of taxes we really feel like we need to stimulate this economy. We Republicans feel very strongly that the tax breaks need to be across the board, that everybody that pays taxes needs to have a tax cut, not have a preponderance of the tax break going to those who currently don't pay any taxes. But most importantly, even more importantly than individual lowering of marginal rates, is to help our corporate men and women, small businesses. I'm not talking about IBM or General Motors or Apple Computer or anybody in that category. I'm talking about small businessmen and women, the ones that, quite honestly, because we goofed up the TARP program, are having such a desperate time getting a loan, a bridge loan to keep those businesses going and to keep the employment rate up in this country. They're not getting what they need. So we feel very strongly that there should be a significant lowering of the corporate income tax rate, maybe from 35 current down to 25 percent.

We feel like that a person who has a 401(k) or an IRA plan, Mr. Speaker, who is under age 59½ and normally would be penalized and have to pay a tax burden for taking money out prematurely from one of those plans, in this desperate year or two, there should be no penalty for withdrawing money out of a 401(k) or an IRA to possibly pay the heating bill or pay for a child's surgery or to ward off foreclosure when they are a couple of months behind on a mortgage payment.

Those are the kind of things that we, on the Republican side, have tried to bring to the committees of jurisdiction that marked up this bill last week, the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee and the committee on which I now serve proudly, the Energy and Commerce Committee. And every little amendment, there weren't many, Mr. Speaker, that we got approved in Energy and Commerce last week, lo and behold, when it was all said and done, those amendments were pulled out of the final bill. And so the bill that we are seeing today, which is kind of an amalgam of those three bills sort of put together, maybe rewritten by the majority leader and the Speaker of the House, none of those Republican amendments, those well-thought-out amendments, after a 12½ hour markup, a lot of hard work went into that, and all of a sudden, poof, they are gone.

And so when President Obama was at our conference today, Mr. Speaker, we

talked to him about that. And he listened. I think he sincerely listened. He made no promises. But I thought it was a very good opportunity, a very good exchange and a good start. And as he pointed out, we would love to be able to have a bill that we could agree on that had a good chance of stimulating this economy and stimulating it quickly and that we could do it in a bipartisan way.

But for that to happen, Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to make some changes that we Republicans can believe in. Let me repeat that. That has been the motto, "change you can believe in." He, in this bill, to get Republican support, is going to have to make some changes that we Republicans and the people that we represent, literally 48 percent of the population of this country, that they, too, can believe in. And so we can only hope that as this bill is marked up in the Senate, and clearly, the two will not be the same, and ultimately there will be a conference report and some changes will be made. And I hope that President Obama, in working with Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader REID, Mr. Speaker, we can work with the Republican minority with our Leader BOEHNER, JOHN BOEHNER, a gentleman from Ohio, and the Senate minority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, a gentleman from Kentucky, that we can get together and this can be a work that we can be proud of that has a good chance of success, that truly we will be pouring water on a fire and not gasoline on a fire.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I see that I have been joined by one of my colleagues, indeed one of my classmates from New Jersey, a gentleman that has served on the Financial Services Committee, he served on the Budget Committee, and I think he has an understanding of this whole process far deeper than most Members. Let me just put it that way.

And so I'm pleased to have with us tonight my good friend from New Jersey, SCOTT GARRETT. And Mr. GARRETT, I will yield some time to you.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Well, I thank you for the introduction and thank you for yielding as well. I don't know if I can live up to the level as being more informed and better versed than many of my colleagues, but let me just try to make a couple of points here in the next couple of minutes.

You are right when you begin by laying out a little bit of a history. And when you do so, what it points out is that really we have been down this road before. Several months ago, we were right here on this floor debating a similar issue, when then Speaker PELOSI said that the sky would fall if we did not take immediate action in the stock market and the credit market and the rest. And of course, at that time we were talking about TARP 1, TARP 1, a spending of \$350 billion, because we were in the midst of a crisis, we were told, a crisis that required

that there be absolutely no alternatives considered. In fact, the Treasury Department said they looked at other ideas and immediately dismissed them. In fact, when we were not even allowed to have a markup or a hearing on it to consider alternatives, no, they had picked the right solution to the problem that we were facing in the fall and winter of last year, and that was their TARP 1 piece of legislation, and we had to rush it through this body, pass it and have the President sign it. And we did that over my objection, and I believe your objection, as well.

At that time we said it was going to solve the problem. But what was the end result? Of course, well, they said if we didn't do it, the stock market would drop about 1,000 points. But by gosh, look where it is now, several thousand points down. And the credit markets, I was just in my office earlier today, credit markets, securitization of housing in the commercial markets, are still equally tight as they were then.

That was followed by TARP 2. It was just a week ago Wednesday of last week. We were again on this floor, and again we were told that we were in a panic phase, a crisis phase, if you will, and we had to vote on TARP 2. And what was TARP 2? TARP 2 was an additional \$350 billion that would again go to now the new administration with no strings attached. And this is the rub that so many of my constituents are so angry about that basically we are just writing a proverbial blank check here, passing it off to the administration, they can use it for whatever they want, buy toxic assets, buy banks, nationalize the banks. If you saw Speaker PELOSI on TV the other day, she refused to use the words "nationalization of the banks." But in essence she said that is exactly what they were doing, buying up the auto companies.

We could have our new Treasury secretary, if he wanted to, he could go out and buy a TurboTax for every American in this country so those people would be able to figure out how their taxes are done and make sure that they pay their right taxes. That is what we basically granted when we passed last Wednesday an additional \$350 billion, again, over my objection, and I believe over your objection as well, when that TARP bill went through. And now here less than a week later, we are on the floor discussing an additional \$800 plus billion, again because we are in a crisis, we are told, and if we don't move now, it will get even worse. And we were told, again, just as in TARP 1, as in TARP 2, no opportunity for hearing, no opportunity really for input, no opportunity for amendments and the like, so that we were in panic phase.

And with that, I would just like to refer you over to an article that was actually in today's "Weekly Standard" written by John Stossel, who I'm sure you're familiar with. The headline of that is, "This Is No Time to Panic." And I think that is extremely important to consider. And it lays it out

pretty well. The subheadline is, "our economy has recovered before and we can do so again." And what he basically lays out here is just take your time, move in a careful and cautious manner, consider all the alternatives which you were not allowed to do in 1 and 2, and move appropriately and the economy will work its way through with appropriate action in Washington that takes all considerations and input to mind. We didn't do that in 1. We didn't do it in 2. And I think obviously we are not going to do it with the expenditure of \$800 billion now.

So going forward, we should consider a couple of points. What do the economists say about this? What do some of their own members say about what is about to go on here? Well, the economists, let's talk about that. We had the President come and speak to us today in the Republican Conference, as you said, and I appreciate the fact that the new President came and said he would reach across the aisle and talk to us about these issues. Although I will add the caveat, each time we threw out some alternatives to him and said, well, we might want to improve the bill in this manner or in that manner, I believe for as long as I was in the conference, each time one of those alternatives was suggested to him, he said, well, I would disagree with you on those points, and I really can't accept that amendment or that suggestion as a change.

But I do still appreciate the fact that he would come and listen to our talks. While he was there, and other times as well, he said that all the economists side with them on the need for a spending plan right now as they have laid out. And in essence, it is sort of the same argument we have heard before where it says there is no economist on the other side. Well, there are economists on the other side. As a matter of fact, there are pages of economists on the other side of this issue who say that the right action is not the one that is being laid out in this stimulus package. The right action is not to put us deeper in debt. And it is not just economists outside of the mainstream. I can refer you, as well, to economists right in the Obama administration.

If you look to an article in the February 9 edition of National Review by Alan Reynolds, he quotes two economists. One is Peter Orszag, who of course is the new administration's head of the Office of Management and Budget. And also he makes reference to Douglas Elmendorf, who is the new Democrat head of CBO. So these are people within the Obama administration who, previous to coming into their administration, or the Democrat side of the aisle, I should say, disagreed with this approach to stimulus with regard to fiscal spending.

Let me just quote from the article with regard to Peter Orszag.

"Former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin co-authored a 2004 paper with forecaster Peter Orszag of the Brookings Institute at that time, who has

now been tapped by the Obama administration to lead the Office of Management and Budget. In that report they argued that 'budget deficits which will occur with this bill, decrease national savings which will reduce domestic investment and increase borrowing abroad.'"

Big budget deficits, warned Rubin and Orszag, would "reduce future national income," and this is the important part as well, risk a "decline in confidence which can reduce stock prices." So that is his new OMB director raising those red flags. Democrats' CBO director said the following, and they warn that "it is critical that efforts to fight a recession" such as we are doing now "do not end up increasing the long-run budget deficit and thus harming long-run growth."

Elmendorf rightly noted that "the idea that Congress should make legislative changes to tax and spending policies in order to counter the business cycle has fallen into disfavor among economists." So there it is right there.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If I reclaim my time just for a second, I hope you will stick with me, I want to hear more from you. But you mentioned the majority CBO, Congressional Budget Office, they came out with a report that said that 7 percent, Mr. Speaker, 7 percent of this money would be spent in 2009 and up to 38 percent by the end of 2010.

□ 2145

So we have this dire emergency and we need spending and we need it right now, and yet only 7 percent of all of these projects are getting into the hands of the people, into the economy, to help grow jobs. Where is the emergency?

Well, I quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, feel there is an emergency. But that is why we take exception to this program and the many things that are in it that really have nothing to do with emergency spending. I mentioned a few of them at the outset. There are others. There are quite a few others.

In fact, Mr. GARRETT, I know you would agree with me, Mr. Speaker, I think he would, that when President Obama came to the conference today, he admitted the same thing. He said look, there is stuff in there if I had my complete way, and I am not sure why he doesn't, but he does have to deal, of course, with the legislative branch, that being Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HARRY REID on the Senate side, but there are things that I think clearly should be, and I bet my colleague from New Jersey would agree with me, it is just regular spending. Whether we are talking about some of the trillions of dollars on education spending, IDEA, increasing Pell Grants, that is part of a regular process that ought to work its way through the authorizing committee, Education and the Workforce, and let the appropriators appropriate money under regular

order. That is not emergency spending. So we have turned this \$825 billion emergency spending package literally into a Christmas tree, and it is not going to help, it is not going to get us out of this deep recession. And we need something that is going to work.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I think when you said I would probably agree with you, I do agree with you.

Before I describe the types of jobs that they may be creating with this so-called bailout of the economy, you have to ask yourself: what is the definition of a job? We have an idea when somebody says I just got a new job, they have a job, employment, a career that they will be starting next Monday and it will last not just through Monday afternoon but through the next year and as long as they perform their duties and services appropriately as to the requirements of their employer, that they will have a job.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. At least to work long enough to make them eligible for Social Security, 10 quarters worth of work.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. There you go. But what the government means when they say they are creating jobs, and the Obama administration has given us different numbers as to how many jobs, 2 or 3 or 4 million jobs, we don't know how many jobs that they are creating, but a job is when an individual works at least one hour during the course of one week, and that means that they have created a job. So I could pay you to paint my fence in front of my house for an hour, and I just created a job. So we could be creating 2 or 3 million of these jobs under this proposal. But is that the type of job and the type of recovery that Americans are truly looking for?

As to what the nature of some of these jobs are, let's look at a couple of them. In Anchorage, Alaska, we have talked about building the bridge to nowhere in Alaska. Here is street lighting. I guess that is putting in light bulbs. That is one job.

Intercom upgrades, someone is rewiring intercoms in buildings.

Bus replacement. I am not sure how that is getting a job.

Also in Anchorage, Alaska, and Alaska does pretty well under this bill, potentially. These are proposals coming from mayors across the country as far as job-ready projects that they can submit to the administration and say let's roll with these programs, Greenbelt Trail resurfacing. I guess that is a job that we are looking to spend money on.

Again street light retrofitting.

Landfill methane recovery project.

In Huntsville, Alabama, they are looking for money to replace bathroom fixtures, software purchases, and replace trolley buses.

Down in Pines Bluff, Arkansas, they are looking to buy a fire department ladder. I am not sure how that creates

a job, but that is what the mayors are submitting to say they are ready to go, dollar ready, and spend this money getting it out the door.

With regard to that, I think the point should be driven home as far as when the money would be spent. The original CBO budget said that only a small percentage of the money will actually go out during the course of this year.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Absolutely. Again, that was a CBO report and it was 7 percent in 2009.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Yes, 7 percent.

Now the number on top of that that the majority has just come out with says actually, we are going to get around two-thirds of the money out in 18 months. Think for a second what that actually means. So 18 months from now will be July 2010. By July, we will be having our summer barbecue, and that is when the bulk of this money will be spent. That is not when we need to get the economy going, that is not when small businesses should be hiring new people, not a year or more from this summer, we should be hiring people today, we should be putting people back to work today. So the idea that the majority is saying is okay is favorable, spending money a year and a half from now as the best-case scenario is one that I think most Americans would have a problem with.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, and I would say to my colleague that the jobs are being lost today. They are not being lost 18 months from now. God help us if we are losing these kinds of job 6, 12, 18 months from now. We better be growing jobs and not losing 15,000, and I think Pfizer Pharmaceutical announced they were going to cut 15,000 jobs out of their workforce. Apple for the first time in its history I think recently announced a significant job loss. The big three automobile manufacturers, despite the fact that they got what, at least \$5 billion, including GMAC, another billion in the first tranche of the TARP money, so these jobs are being lost and lost now. And as my colleague from New Jersey points out, we need to save these jobs, save the ones that we can and grow new jobs, but not 6, 12, 18 months from now but right now.

I wanted to just mention for my colleagues' sake on both sides of the aisle, sometimes it is a little difficult to know what is exactly in these massive bills, particularly one that has been brought to the floor in such rapid-fire fashion without any input really from the minority side, but maybe without much input, if any, from the rank and file of the Democratic majority. But, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, including Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey, just listen to a few of the things that are in this economic stimulus package: \$650 million for digital TV coupons; \$650 million for new cars for the Federal Government; \$6 billion for colleges and universities, many of which have

billion dollar endowments; \$50 million in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. That is a perfect example of something, Mr. Speaker, that should be funded under regular order. It should be debated and a case made whether or not that needs to be increased or decreased, not thrown in here in the dark of night and said we are going to spend \$50 million because it is part of an economic stimulus package. It is not.

There is \$44 million for repairs to the United States Department of Agriculture headquarters. What do they need new carpet, retrofitting of their bathroom fixtures? Can't that wait? Is that going to create new jobs? I don't think so.

There is \$200 million as we said earlier for The National Mall, including \$21 million for sod. I could go on and on. Some might say you are nitpicking, you are just going in there and picking out things that sound and look bad. Believe me, there are others that sound and look a whole lot worse. It is just a recurring theme. So we feel very strongly, and I want to spend some time talking about this because my colleague on the floor with me tonight, Representative GARRETT from New Jersey, he and I are both members of the Republican Study Committee, the more conservative 108 Republican Members out of about 175 of us now, in the minority, who have a better plan, we think, for stimulating this economy. We call it the Economic Recovery and Middle Class Tax Relief Act of 2009.

I want to bring out just a few of the things that are in that bill. We have submitted it. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill. I think the original cosponsors, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. Speaker, and that would be Dr. TOM PRICE of my great home State of Georgia, and JIM JORDAN, the gentleman from Ohio, and a couple of other members of the Republican Study Committee, but here are some of the provisions.

We would provide an across-the-board tax cut of 5 percent for everybody who pays taxes. Every marginal rate, we would cut 5 percent. If you are paying 10 percent, it is 5. If you are paying in the 15 percent bracket, it is 10. If you are paying in the 28 percent bracket, it is 23. And we feel very strongly about that.

We would increase the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$5,000.

We would repeal the AMT. Very quickly, I think the general public has heard enough about this to understand it. I know my colleagues understand it. AMT, alternative minimum tax, which was put in place 25 or 30 years ago to make sure that maybe 125 ultra-rich people had to pay some taxes, they couldn't use legal loopholes with very smart Philadelphia tax lawyers to get out of paying any taxes, and so it had to be calculated in two ways and they had to pay an alternative minimum tax. Well, it was not indexed for inflation and this year come April 15, 25

million middle income taxpayers are getting caught by the AMT, and that should be repealed. It should not have any kind of a PAYGO provision. It is a wrong tax. It was never meant to apply to these 24 million, and it should be repealed and repealed permanently.

We want to make the capital gains tax lower and we want to make the dividends tax rate 15 percent and permanent. We want to increase by 50 percent the value of the tax deduction for interest on student loans and the tax deduction for qualified higher education expenses.

We want to make all withdrawals from retirement accounts tax free, as I said earlier, during the year 2009.

There are a number of other provisions in the bill. I know that my colleague from New Jersey is very familiar with that. I would love to yield to him at this time and we will further discuss the RSC stimulus bill which is called the Economic Recovery and Middle Class Tax Relief Act of 2009 which we firmly believe will get us out of this recession because people will have money in their hands that they will spend and we will not have to worry about this massive bureaucracy throwing \$825 billion out the window and hoping that it sticks somewhere.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, before I speak to the many merits of that piece of legislation, I just want to reiterate another point as to how we got here and what we are getting from the other side.

As I mentioned before, the proponents of the bailout bill that we are about to vote on tomorrow would say that the economists are on their side and there are no economists on the other side, and I made the argument that there are a number of economists who support our view, that the way to go is just what you were laying out in the Economic Recovery and Middle Class Tax Relief Act.

I should also point out that even within their own conference, there is growing realization that the way to get job creation going in this country is not by rushing a bill through this House without due deliberations, rushing a piece of legislation that is going to put our children and grandchildren in debt.

□ 2200

And so I just wanted to point out that our friend from the other side of the aisle and the chairman of the Capital Markets Committee in Financial Services, Representative PAUL KANJORSKI—who, by the way, just an hour or so ago was trying to make a positive amendment to the underlying bill and was rebuffed in the Rules Committee—this is what he had to say on C-SPAN with regard to his own party. He said, the Democrats, “have lost our way, and that we shouldn't be pressed by any silly deadlines.” He went on to say further, “We need to take our time. And I guarantee you we're going to come

back and we're going to have to have another stimulus on top of this. We're going to have another bailout for Wall Street because we are not doing things properly.” He says, again, “I think we lost our way in a way. We shouldn't be pressed by these deadlines. You know, what makes the President's Day holiday”—which is where they were initially aiming for—“so important for us to get out of town to get these things done?” Which just goes to show that there are individuals from both sides of the aisle who realize that when you're talking about such sums of money and when you're talking about such a situation that we're in right now, that a solution is not to be found by rushing to judgment, nor is a solution to be found by putting all consideration to alternatives aside.

That's why I commend the gentleman from Georgia to making reference to the RSC, the Republican Study Committee, proposal. Because what this does is to make a realization that the failed policies of the past, as far as economic policy of saying that we can spend our way into a new paradise of the economic situation, history does not prove that. If you think about the Great Depression—which a lot of people are now referencing right now—some of them from the other side of the aisle will make that argument and say, well, what pulled us out of the Depression they'll say was FDR. And I know our new President makes reference to himself with regard to FDR, besides Lincoln. But the other side of the aisle will say that the way to get out of this doldrums is do additional spending such as the New Deal, and that's what they're talking about today is another New Deal.

But if you actually study the history of the Great Depression—and I know there is much dispute as to how we got into the Depression in the first place, but I will commend the gentleman from Georgia to an article written by Robert Higgs which makes the case very well that going into the Depression, there is question as to how we got into it, not so much into question is how we got out of it. And how we got out of it was an opportunity by the private sector to make decisions on their own to invest as they wanted to invest, hire people how they want to be hired, and to do so without excessive control by the Federal Government.

And I'll bring this all around to your point of why the RSC's bill is so important. During the Great Depression you had the FDR, the Roosevelt administration, setting up a whole alphabet soup of new agencies to regulate the economy. During the Depression, you had excessive government expenditures in various sectors of the economy, all of which made the private sector basically say, we're going to sit back for a little while. We're not going to invest anything because tomorrow, where I invest over here, the government may start regulating in such a way that I can't make a profit; or tomorrow, if I

decide to invest over here, the government may decide to subsidize my competitor, so I will not be able to make a profit.

So during that time, during the Depression, the investor groups or individuals stayed on the sideline. And it wasn't until the Great Escape, when the Roosevelt administration began to back off, that investors began to get into the market again. The legislation you refer to, the RSC bill, would go in the direction of what came after FDR and during what we call "the Great Escape," allowing for the investor class to say I'm going to invest again. And why are they going to do so? Just because of all those great things that you listed right there. Section 179 expensing. An investor is going to say, I can start investing tomorrow. I can buy this new machine, this new factory, this new truck, or what have you, to hire new people because I can expense it today.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. This is without a doubt. And I'm glad you mentioned section 179. I think under current law, section 179, Mr. Speaker, of course is that section of the Internal Revenue Code which does allow a small business to expense a certain amount of capital improvement or equipment purchase in the very first year. But it's limited under current law, I believe—Mr. GARRETT, correct me if I'm wrong—to about \$125,000.

We say, in the Economic Recovery and Middle Class Relief Act of 2009, the RSC stimulus package, that that ought to be expanded. And not only that, but also to immediately cut the top corporate income tax rate from 35 percent down to 25 percent. And my colleagues and my friends, that would just align us with the average rate in the European Union. We're all talking about the European Union and what they're doing on cap and trade and global warming and how we ought to get in line with that—even though it will probably break our economy at a time that we can ill afford to do so—but yet we let them rob our bank, literally, with a more attractive corporate tax rate, and we drive our corporations offshore. That makes absolutely no sense. So there are so many things that we could do with the tax code.

And I want to say one other thing before yielding back to my colleague. You know, I've heard the majority side talk about the tax portion of this stimulus bill, the \$250 billion or so worth of tax incentives, and this business of refundability of a tax credit to people for their payroll taxes, people that don't even pay taxes. And the attitude is that, well, the RSC is wrong; you shouldn't cut taxes across the board because people at a higher income level—let's say \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 a year—they won't have to spend that money and they will just hold onto it and it won't get flowing in the economy, it won't stimulate the economy. But these nearly poor and poor people

have no choice but to spend that money because they're desperate, they have to spend the money. They can't save it, they can't pay down their debt, they can't put it in a college fund for their child. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is insulting to these people—good, hard-working salt-of-the-earth people—who I truly believe know how to control their money and know when to spend and know when to save and know when to pay down debt and know when to tear up their credit cards. But no, we have this attitude that only uncle knows, only uncle knows and has to make the decision for us.

And I'm just afraid, Mr. Speaker—and that's why I'm opposed to this bill in its present form—I just feel that we're only going to get one shot at this. We are losing too many jobs, the economy is in a severe downturn—I think it's fair to say a deep recession—and we need to give it our best shot. And we certainly don't need to be throwing gasoline on the fire.

And so I yield back to my colleague for some additional comments and then we'll move to close.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. It looks like the time is coming to a close. And it just makes me think, as someone else said earlier today, there is a culture of arrogance, I believe, in the Nation's Capitol when the thought is that the bureaucrats and the Representatives here in this House know how to spend the money better than the people back at home. There is an arrogance to think that there is elitist—whether it's here or some administrative agency—that they are somehow imbued with special qualities, that their action of spending a dollar will generate more wealth for this country than if you and I or our constituents spend a dollar.

And of course we're not really only spending a dollar, are we? We're talking about billions and trillions of dollars. And if this \$5 bill was actually a \$1,000 bill and I put it right here, how many would I need of those to have a million dollars? Well, I would need four inches of these stacked up here to give to you and then say that you would be a millionaire. And how many of these, if these were \$1,000, would I have to have stacked up here in order to say go out tomorrow and spend a trillion dollars—which is just about what the other side wants to do? I would need to have this stack go 63 miles into the air, into the space. That's how much money we're talking about spending. And the arrogance is that we somehow think that we know how to spend it better.

How much money are we talking about here? And I will close on this. If you took all the money that Congress or that Washington ever spent on the Marshall plan to rebuild Europe and added that to all the money that this country used to buy the Louisiana Purchase some time ago, and you added that to all the money that we spent in this country to the race to the moon,

and you added that to all the money that we had to spend to get us out of the savings and loan crisis, and then you added to that all the money that we spent on the Korean War, and then you added that to all the money that FDR spent on the New Deal, and then you added that to all the money that we spent on the invasion of Iraq, and finally, if you added all the money that we spent on the entire Vietnam War, all those things together would not equal what the other side of the aisle thinks that they know how to spend better than the American taxpayer. And I think the American taxpayer knows how to spend it far better.

With that, I yield back to you for closing comments.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. My colleague from New Jersey, I appreciate those figures. And boy, if that doesn't put it into perspective for all of us, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say this, and then I want to recognize my colleague from Minnesota, possibly, for a minute. But at the end of our conference today, Mr. Speaker, with President Obama, our conference chairman, MIKE PENCE, the gentleman from Indiana, said to the President, one thing is for sure, you have our prayers. And you have our prayers on both sides of the aisle. We'll be praying for the administration, we'll be praying for the leadership. We'll be praying for the majority and the minority that we can do the right thing for the American people.

I see that my colleagues are leaving. So as I finish up, again, I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this issue is much too important for partisan politics, but it is about policy. And if we're going to be—we, the Republican minority—are going to be the loyal opposition, then it is our duty, it's our responsibility to express our concern in a respectful way to the President of the United States, to President Obama, and to Majority Leader REID in the Senate and the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, here in this great body, that we have some concerns. We want you to listen to us. We want to work with you. We want to save this economy so that we can help all the American people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOUCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCALISE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 3.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 3.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, January 28.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today and January 28.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 28, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

270. A letter from the Chief, Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of the Hawaiian and Territorial Fruits and Vegetables Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0052] (RIN: 0579-AC70) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Installations and Environment, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the decision to conduct a streamlined A-76 competition of aircraft maintenance functions being performed by one hundred nine (109) military personnel in various locations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Golden Parachute Payments (RIN: 2590-AA08) received January 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

273. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2007," pursuant to Section 641(e) of the Head Start Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

274. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Casper, Wyoming) [MB Docket No.: 08-108 RM-11451] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

275. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Kansas City, Missouri) [MB Docket No.: 08-111 RM-11454] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

276. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Kearney, Nebraska) [MB Docket No.: 08-199 RM-11486] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

277. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Omaha, Nebraska) [MB Docket No.: 08-115 RM-11445] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

278. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Superior, Nebraska) [MB Docket No.: 08-209 RM-11496] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

279. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Huntsville, Alabama) [MB Docket No.: 08-194 RM-11488] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

280. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Superior, Nebraska) [MB Docket No.: 08-209 RM-11496] received January 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

281. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities; E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers [CG Docket No.: 03-123; CC Docket No.: 98-67; WC Docket No.: 05-196] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

282. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

283. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report in accordance with Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

284. A letter from the Attorney — DOT Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Railroad Safety Enforcement Procedures; Enforcement, Appeal and Hearing Procedures for Rail Routing Decisions [FRA-2007-28573] (RIN: 2130-AB87) received January 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

285. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's report on a June 2008 limited reevaluation study conducted to review previous reports

prepared for the Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park (Mod Waters) project; (H. Doc. No. 111-11); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

286. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting an interim response to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate problems and opportunities associated with ecosystem restoration and protection for the New York and New Jersey Port District; (H. Doc. No. 111-12); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

287. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a study on the Santa Cruz River, Paseo de las Iglesias, Pima County, Arizona, pursuant to Public Law 75-761; (H. Doc. No. 111-13); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

288. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting a study that recommends authorization of an ecosystem restoration and recreation project for an eight-mile reach of the Salt River between 19th Avenue and 83rd Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona; (H. Doc. No. 111-14); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

289. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the budgeting for the Island Creek Local Protection Project, Logan, West Virginia; (H. Doc. No. 111-15); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

290. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director Energy, Science and Water, Department of the Army, transmitting a study for the ecosystem restoration and recreation for the Salt River (Va Shly'ay Akimel), Maricopa County, Arizona; (H. Doc. No. 111-16); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

291. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a feasibility study to evaluate problems and opportunities for East St. Louis, Illinois; (H. Doc. No. 111-17); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

292. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report of the Department of Health and Human Services entitled, "Geographic Variation in Drug Prices and Spending in the Part D Program," pursuant to Section 107 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANGEL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 598. A bill to provide for a portion of the economic recovery package relating to revenue measures, unemployment, and health; with an amendment (Rept. 111-8, Pt. 1).

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 92. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and

local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Science and Technology, Education and Labor, and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 598 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. STARK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SALAZAR, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 699. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 700. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. FALLIN (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 701. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer enemy combatants detained by the United States at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to any facility in Oklahoma, or to construct any facility for such enemy combatants in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 702. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to im-

prove early education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 703. A bill to promote bank liquidity and lending through deposit insurance, the HOPE for Homeowners Program, and other enhancements; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 704. A bill to provide for free mailing privileges for personal correspondence and parcels sent to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in Iraq or Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage teachers to pursue teaching science, technology, engineering, and math subjects at elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NOR- TON, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 706. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to continue to administer the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHILDERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MASSA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr.

BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. ARCURI):

H.R. 707. A bill to provide monthly vouchers to members of the Armed Forces serving in overseas operations, or hospitalized due to a disease or injury incurred as a result of service in such operations, that a member may transfer to another person to permit the person to mail, without charge, correspondence and small parcels to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 708. A bill to restrict assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 709. A bill to reauthorize the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing assistance for Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 710. A bill to secure additional Tier I capital for the United States banking system from parties other than the Federal Government by providing authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to guaranty certain new preferred stock investments made by public pensions acting in a collective fashion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 711. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to remove the registration exception for certain investment advisors with less than 15 clients; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 712. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require in the annual report of each defined benefit pension plan disclosure of plan investments in hedge funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 713. A bill to require the President's Working Group on Financial Markets to conduct a study on the hedge fund industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 714. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 715. A bill to expand the boundary of Saguaro National Park, to study additional land for future adjustments to the boundary of the Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 716. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide coverage for individuals participating in approved cancer clinical trials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. McGovern):

H.R. 717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to improve America's research competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 718. A bill to reinstate the Interim Management Strategy governing off-road vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, pending the issuance of a final rule for off-road vehicle use by the National Park Service; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEE of New York:

H.R. 719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend relief from the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of New York:

H.R. 720. A bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040S; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the exception from the 10 percent penalty for early withdrawals from governmental plans for qualified public safety employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 722. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide an option of States to cover a children's program of all-inclusive coordinated care (ChiPACC) under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 723. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period for Social Security disability and the 24-month waiting period for Medicare benefits in the cases of individuals with disabling burn injuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 724. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to increase the number of qualified nursing faculty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 725. A bill to protect Indian arts and crafts through the improvement of applicable criminal proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit and a deduction for small political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 727. A bill to provide for the issuance of bonds to provide funding for the construction of schools of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the

committee concerned.

By Mr. PUTNAM (for himself and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H.R. 728. A bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040S; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 729. A bill to help keep students safe on school-run, overnight, off-premises field trips; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 730. A bill to strengthen efforts in the Department of Homeland Security to develop nuclear forensics capabilities to permit attribution of the source of nuclear material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 731. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude individuals who have been convicted of committing certain sex offenses from receiving certain burial-related benefits and funeral honors which are otherwise available to certain veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and related individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 732. A bill to authorize the grant program under which the Secretary of Homeland Security makes discretionary grants for use in high-threat, high-density urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony in honor of the bicentennial of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself and Mr. TURNER):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding sexual assaults and rape in the military; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H. Res. 91. A resolution honoring the life and service of Dr. William Spoelhof, president emeritus of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 93. A resolution honoring the Armed Forces from the Inland Empire in California and their families for their extraordinary sacrifices serving the United States in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 94. A resolution urging the Secretary of the Treasury to take certain ac-

tions under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to protect the interests of the taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SIREs (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BACA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HARE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. REYES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Res. 95. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Girls and Women in Sports Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

2. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 232 memorializing the Congress of the United States to assist Michigan in rebuilding the state's economy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO introduced a bill (H.R. 733) for the relief of Jayantibhai Desai and Indiraben Patel; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. POSEY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 31: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 80: Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 85: Mr. OLSON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. NYE.

H.R. 106: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 147: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 153: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 154: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 155: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 156: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 159: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 175: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 179: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 181: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 200: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 234: Ms. TITUS and Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 235: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 240: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 254: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 294: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 301: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 333: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 347: Mr. WEINER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. HARE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 361: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 367: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 377: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 378: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 379: Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 381: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 391: Mr. SHADEGG.
 H.R. 392: Mr. LATTA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 424: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 426: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 460: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
 H.R. 463: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MASSA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 470: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. SHADEGG.
 H.R. 471: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 490: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 498: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 502: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 503: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 510: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 515: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 527: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 536: Mr. FILNER, Mr. NYE, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 537: Mr. SIRES and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 538: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 578: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 593: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 610: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 614: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 620: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 621: Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 634: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 658: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H. J. Res. 11: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H. J. Res. 16: Mr. POSEY.
 H. J. Res. 18: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. NADLER of New York.
 H. Res. 18: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H. Res. 22: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. FILNER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H. Res. 70: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H. Res. 75: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SOLIS of California, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H. Res. 77: Mr. WOLF.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND STATE ASSISTANCE

For construction, improvements, repair, or replacement of facilities related to the revitalization of state and local parks and recreation facilities, \$125,000,000 is made available under the Land and Water Conservation Act Stateside Assistance Program, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601(4)–(11)), except that such funds shall not be subject to the matching requirements in section 4601–89(c) of that Act:

URBAN PARKS (UPARR)

For construction, improvements, repair, or replacement of facilities related to the revitalization of urban parks and recreation facilities, \$100,000,000 is made available under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 13 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), except that such funds shall not be subject to the matching requirements in section 2505 (a) of the Act: Provided, That the amount set aside from this appropriation pursuant to section 1106 of this Act shall be not more than 5 percent instead of the percentage specified in such section and such funds are to remain available until expended: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 2504 of the UPARR Act of 1978 (P.L. 95–625), any local government within a Bureau of the Census defined metropolitan statistical area may apply for assistance under the UPARR program. Cities and counties meeting this criterion, but not among the originally designated eligible units of government, would have to include the required distress factors as part of their applications for funding.

H.R. 1

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the appropriate place in title VIII of the bill, insert the following:

Provided further, That no funds shall be precluded from being dispensed for use for the restoration, creation, or maintenance of local and community parks.

H.R. 1

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 175, strike lines 1 through 8.

Page 647, after line 12, insert the following new section and make the necessary conforming change in the table of contents:

SEC. 7008. SPECIAL RULE ON CONTRACTING.

Each local agency receiving a grant or money under this Act shall ensure that, if the agency carries out modernization, renovation, or repair through a contract, the process for any such contract ensures the maximum number of qualified bidders, including local, small, minority, women- and veteran-owned businesses, through full and open competition.